



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 110<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 154

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 2008

No. 143

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

Dr. David O. Dykes, Pastor, Green Acres Baptist Church, Tyler, Texas, offered the following prayer:

Our Father, as the Psalmist prayed, we proclaim that "the Lord is my strength and my shield; my heart trusts in Him and I am helped."

Father, on this very day 7 years ago, we were not prepared for how our Nation and our lives would change within a single day. But since that day, we have found that Your grace is enough. We desperately depend upon Your future grace. We praise You that You are not a spectator God who sits in heaven uncaring and unconcerned. You are a loving Father who has numbered the hairs on our head. Your wounded feet still walk with us on the road of suffering. Your heart that was broken on the cross still feels our every pain.

And so, Father, give to Your servants wisdom and grace. May Your kingdom come and Your will be done. We humbly ask in the name that is above every name, Your Son, our Redeemer, Jesus Christ. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SIREs) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. SIREs led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING DR. DAVID O. DYKES

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. GOHMERT. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Dr. David O. Dykes has been pastor of Green Acres Baptist Church for about 17 years while being a true leader, spiritual guide, and dear friend.

In Tyler, Texas, Green Acres has over 14,000 members and is the most mission-minded church anywhere. Recognized this year with the highest award of the Southern Baptist Convention, Brother David, as his church knows him, has taken seriously the admonitions of Jesus to feed His sheep, minister to their needs, and take the Gospel into all the world.

As I heard here from a Florida pastor yesterday, Brother David is truly an inspiration and a blessing because of his evident burden for reaching out to help others. He faithfully serves our church, the local community, our country and world. He dearly loves his amazing wife, Cindy, their daughters Jenni and Laura Grace, and their husbands Jason and Jim. He and Cindy are now the proud grandparents of Lizzi and Caroline. God's love is evident in the life and love of Brother David as today's congressional chaplain.

Madam Speaker, though I am allowed only 1 minute, it would take many times more than that to adequately extol the virtues of this great American pastor.

### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2403) "An Act to designate the new Federal Courthouse, located in the 700 block of East Broad Street, Richmond, Virginia, as the "Spottswood W. Robinson III

and Robert R. Merhige, Jr. Federal Courthouse.'".

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PAS-TOR). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

### JERSEY CITY REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY

(Mr. SIREs asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SIREs. Mr. Speaker, I rise to highlight the good work of the Jersey City Redevelopment Agency in the 13th District of New Jersey, which I have the honor of representing.

The Jersey City Redevelopment Agency has a distinguished history in the fight to eliminate blight, to create opportunities, and to attract residential, commercial and industrial real estate projects in Jersey City.

Since its inception 60 years ago, the Jersey City Redevelopment Agency has been responsible for the direct reinvestment of billions of dollars in Jersey City and tens of thousands of jobs. The agency is committed to enhancing the quality of life for all residents of Jersey City by guiding responsible development and reinvestment in all neighborhoods and communities in Jersey City. They work daily to enhance the quality of life of their residents and improve economic and housing opportunities while building strong, viable partnerships with the Jersey City community.

Please join me in honoring the Jersey City Redevelopment Agency as they celebrate their 60th year in business and as they continue to build a better Jersey City for all residents.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H7959

# HOW MUCH MORE CAN BARACK OBAMA DISRESPECT WOMEN?

(Mrs. MILLER of Michigan asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the campaign of BARACK OBAMA cannot refute Governor Sarah Palin's record of change and reform as Governor of Alaska. She took on the "Old Boy Network" in Alaska and she won. She took on corruption throughout State government and rooted it out. She took on Big Oil and made it serve the interests of her State. She is a true agent of change.

So now the Obama campaign has decided that the way to get at Sarah Palin is through personal attacks and sexist insults. Yesterday, the Associated Press quoted the following: "'You can put lipstick on a pig,' Obama said to an outbreak of laughter, shouts and raucous applause from his audience, clearly drawing a connection to Palin's joke. 'It's still a pig.'"

Well, Mr. Speaker, Senator OBAMA might find such jokes funny, but women will only find them insulting. American women also understand that if this is the kind of change that Senator OBAMA is offering to America, it is really no change at all. Senator OBAMA owes Governor Palin and the women of America an apology.

## WE NEED A CHANGE IN WASHINGTON

(Mr. KAGEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because of a great change that is taking place in northeast Wisconsin, a change brought on by the failed economic policies of the current administration, an administration that doesn't care about people, rather, they care about corporate profits. What is taking place in Wisconsin is taking place across the middle part of this country. We are losing our jobs overseas.

The paper industry in Wisconsin is being decimated, and recently a paper mill closed. One of the families that lost their position was Bruce Van Zeeland, who writes, "It turned our life upside down, working at one company for 28 years and having no other skills in this horrible job market. My wife is struggling to find a full-time job now. We cannot help out our three kids in college. We worry about losing our home."

This is the change that came about from this Republican dominated House for 12 years and the current administration. We do need a change in Washington, and the Van Zeelands need it now.

## SEPTEMBER 11

(Mr. SMITH of Nebraska asked and was given permission to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will look back on a dark day which changed our Nation and the world forever.

On September 11, 2001, we felt the tremors of the World Trade Center collapsing and the attack on the Pentagon. We suffered the destruction of Flight 93 in rural Pennsylvania. And we came together as a country.

On that day, we learned those who would use terror and violence make no distinction between innocent victims and soldiers. We learned the terrible lengths terrorists would go to, and their utter disregard for human life. We mourned the loss of so many of our fellow citizens.

In the days, weeks, months and years since, we have honored the sacrifice and courage of those who showed the world America has men and women willing to lay down their lives for their fellow citizens.

Mr. Speaker, our thoughts should be on the lives lost on September 11, 2001 and of the men and women of our Armed Forces who are fighting for our freedom to this day.

□ 1015

## OIL SECURITY

(Mr. OLVER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, the cornerstone of our Republican colleagues' energy mantra these days is "Drill Now, Drill Anywhere" to eliminate our dependence on foreign oil and to bring gasoline prices now. "Drill now, drill anywhere" works more like a concrete boot than a cornerstone. In the interest of America's national security, that is just about the worst policy we could adopt.

According to our Geological Survey and our Minerals Management Survey, our total oil reserves both on land and offshore would only last 15 to 20 years at the rate America consumes oil today, which is 8 billion barrels a year and still rising. What exactly would America do in 15 to 20 years when all of our oil is used up and the only remaining sources of oil are controlled by some of the most undemocratic oil dictatorships around the world?

Think about it, America, before it's too late.

## COMPREHENSIVE ENERGY REFORM; THE TIME FOR CONGRESS TO ACT IS NOW

(Mr. LATTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I spent the month of August traveling throughout my district speaking with my constituents about what issues matter to them most. Hands down, energy prices are their number one concern.

As I toured factories, management explained how the rising cost of energy was forcing them to raise the cost of their products, oftentimes making foreign-made goods more appealing to consumers. When I met with farmers, they explained the high cost of fuel, fertilizer, and chemicals. Some farmers are spending over \$900 a day to run their tractors.

At our county fairs and events throughout the district, families described the impact of high gas prices and how it is affecting their spending and savings plans, putting their financial future and stability into jeopardy.

During these discussions, I took pride in telling everyone that House Republicans were fighting during the entire August recess for lower energy costs with an "all of the above" plan that includes the responsible recovery of our natural resources in addition to further development of renewable and alternative energy.

Without comprehensive energy reform, our constituents and economy will continue to suffer. It's time for Congress to act now.

## STROLLING DOWN MEMORY LANE: THE BUSH PRESIDENCY

(Mr. McDERMOTT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, with the clock winding down on the President's second term, this seems like a good time to stroll down memory lane, looking back on America then and now.

Under this President the number of Americans without health care has risen from 38 million to 46 million. Under this President the price of gasoline has risen from less than \$1.50 a gallon to \$4 a gallon. Under this President the unemployment rate has risen to over 6 percent, with millions more Americans out of work and running out of help. Under this President the prices that Americans pay for food, fuel, college, transportation, and medical costs have risen by 25 percent. And let's not forget that mortgage foreclosures are rising while housing prices are falling, like a rock. This President has been willing to bail out Wall Street but never mind Main Street.

Strolling down memory lane can be very educational, especially when you consider the President is running for an unprecedented third term. They talk about change, but only the names will change. The Republican "wreck-economic" policies that created this economic disaster will remain exactly the same. That's not nostalgia; that's a promise from this administration.

## DRILL, BABY, DRILL, AND MINE COAL

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, here's the difference between both sides. Following my colleague, who says this administration, this President, what he fails to mention is that the Democrat majority in this House for the past 2 years is part of the problem. I recognize that.

Here is the price of a barrel of crude oil when President Bush came in: \$23 a barrel. Here's the price of a barrel of crude oil when this Democrat majority came in: \$58 a barrel. Today it's at \$103. We can't sustain that. We can blame everybody we want, but this is a problem we can't sustain.

Drill, baby, drill. Here's the Outer Continental Shelf. They want to only to do 20 percent, maybe. They can't even get an agreement on what they want. This whole area should be open for exploration recovery of oil and gas in our country to help decrease our reliance on imported crude oil and lower prices, and they don't have a clue. They'll continue to say "no" to oil and gas exploration.

They won't even address coal as part of the solution. Coal is the greatest resource we have in this country.

I want to drill, baby, drill, and I want to mine coal.

#### IF YOU WANT CHANGE, YOU WANT THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

(Mr. COHEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, it's a bit confusing sometimes to listen to the rhetoric. The Republicans have had the Presidency now for nearly 8 years, and they have had the majority in this House since 1994, I think. And if you watched the Republican convention, you would think they were the Democrats talking about change and the problems we have in Washington. They're so against Washington, it's the Washington they have created and cultivated. And the corruption that we've seen here has mostly been on that particular side of the aisle. The failure of our having a children's health plan, which this country should have as a cornerstone of its policy, was the fault of the Republican side that was more interested in tobacco interests than children's interests. And too many times we see the corporate interests of the oil corporations take over the interests of the American society and getting us to be truly energy independent.

I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that the parties have differences, but if you want change, you want the Democratic Party. BARACK OBAMA was a community organizer like Jesus, whom our minister prayed about. Pontius Pilate was a Governor.

#### ENERGY

(Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it's been 5 weeks since we have been in session here on the House floor. But there have been many of us that have been on this floor throughout the month of August. We have talked directly with the American people about the immediate need for comprehensive energy legislation. And during August, it became crystal clear that there's a disconnect between what is happening on the streets of America and what is happening here in Washington, DC.

One day my colleague was talking and in a moment of doubt and frustration, he said, "I don't even know if anybody is listening," to which somebody stood up on the floor here and said, "America is listening, Congressman. America is listening." And he was right.

The American people are hurting. At a gas station in North Augusta, South Carolina, one gentleman, a special needs gentleman, came up to me and said, "Congressman, I can only afford \$39 of gas, half a tank, because that's all I have and that's got to do me."

What are we doing to help this gentleman?

Mr. Speaker, let's quit the partisanship. This is an American problem and we need American solutions. Comprehensive legislation, all of the above.

#### REPUBLICAN FAILURES ON THE ECONOMY; WE CANNOT AFFORD MORE OF THE SAME

(Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Americans everywhere are paying the high price of 7 years of failed Republican economic policies that have favored the wealthiest few and the big corporations at the expense of middle class families, including in my State of Maryland.

Today, 3.4 million more Americans are unemployed than when President Bush took office 7 years ago. This year alone more than 600,000 jobs have been lost. Economists estimate that our economy must create at least 150,000 jobs every month. Well, this administration hasn't done that.

The job losses that have occurred on President Bush's watch stand in stark contrast to the millions of jobs created under President Clinton's economy back in the 1990s. Over this same 8-month period in Clinton's second term, the economy created 1.4 million jobs, and we have lost 600,000 jobs under this administration just this year alone.

Mr. Speaker, for 6 years straight, Washington Republicans implemented economic policies that favored the interests of Wall Street over the interests of Main Street. It's time for a dramatic change, one that takes us away from the failed Republican policies of the last 8 years and enables us to really tackle the challenges of the 21st century.

#### THE FAILED ECONOMIC POLICIES OF THE DEMOCRATS

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to the Congress, I was appalled at the comments that were being made on the other side. Having come from a legislative position, I was not used to people getting up and telling out-and-out boldfaced untruths. It has been a real learning experience for me, but that has continued particularly in the last 2 years with our colleagues on the other side. They stand up here and try to blame what has happened in this country in the last 2 years on the President of the United States when the Democrats are in charge of the Congress.

One of the best things we accomplished during the month of August, when Republicans stood on this floor for 5 weeks while Democrats were on vacation, was call attention to the fact that the Democrats are in charge. The failed economic policies of the past 2 years belong strictly to the Democrats because they have allowed gas prices to double and they have done absolutely nothing.

Now they're bringing up a bill they say that's going to do something about gas prices. Well, I think that bill will probably deserve the "Emperor's New Clothes" award and somebody is going to have to say that.

#### HEALTH CARE

(Mr. ALTMIRE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ALTMIRE. Mr. Speaker, while some in the minority party and in the Presidential race are trying to recast themselves as agents of change, nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, the Republicans controlled this House for the first 6 years of the Bush administration and in the past 2 years they have done little more than obstruct our attempts to correct the misguided policies of the past.

In the past 8 years, the number of Americans living without health insurance has increased by more than 7 million. Today nearly one in nine children lack health insurance. After retaking control of Congress, we tried not once but twice to ensure that 10 million children had access to health care through the Children's Health Insurance Program, which serves families that are working hard and playing by the rules but can't afford health care for their kids. And although we were able to pass the bill through Congress, President Bush vetoed it twice and Senator MCCAIN recently said that was the right decision.

Mr. Speaker, we must work together to find ways to improve our health care system, especially for our children. More of the same just won't do.

# SUSPENSION BILLS: MAJOR POLICY DECISIONS BY THE LEADERSHIP OF THE MAJORITY PARTY

(Mr. BURGESS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor of the House this morning to talk about energy. But I just want to say a word about what was just discussed.

We have had major policy decisions in health care come to the floor of this House, not through my Subcommittee on Health in Energy and Commerce, not through the full Committee on Energy and Commerce. No. It comes directly from the Speaker's Office to the floor of the House. It comes up under suspension because who wants to vote against health? Who wants to vote against doctors?

But the reality is major changes in public policy are going on with no discussion in committee, no ability to amend or improve a bill on the floor of the House, no ability to offer an alternative before we vote because they are brought up under suspension.

This is wrong and this is indicative of the type of leadership that this House has had for the last 20 months. This is what the American people say they want changed. When they talk about change, they're talking about change from the top, and it's high time it happened.

## DEMOCRATS LOOK TO JUMP-START THE BUSH ECONOMY BY PASSING SECOND ECONOMIC RECOVERY PLAN

(Mr. PERLMUTTER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, you can put lipstick on the failed Bush-McCain policies, but they are still the same old Bush-McCain policies. And those Bush-McCain policies have led our Nation into a recession. Americans need a new direction and a change.

Since taking control of Congress last year, congressional Democrats have been working to rebuild the Bush-McCain economy and help families struggling to make ends meet. We started by enacting the first increase in the Federal minimum wage in almost a decade, directly helping an estimated 5.3 million Americans and setting a new wage floor for another 7.2 million lower wage workers. When it's fully phased in, the pay raise will place an additional \$4,400 in the paychecks of these workers. This year we extended assistance to unemployed workers who are having a difficult time finding a job in a Bush-McCain economy that is simply not producing jobs. Now we are preparing to introduce a new economic package that will invest in America and create new jobs.

Mr. Speaker, Congress cannot afford to wait to jump-start this economy. We must act this month.

□ 1030

## LET'S NOT BEG OPEC

(Mr. TERRY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TERRY. Yesterday, OPEC met. OPEC decided to cut production because they were frustrated that the price per barrel was nearing the \$100 per barrel price. My goodness. What a tragedy for them. Isn't it a problem for this country that we rely so heavily on foreign oil? OPEC controls the majority of oil production. Our energy policy should not have to be begging OPEC for more production.

Yesterday, our electric company that serves my district announced they're raising the rates because the train company that hauls the coal to them had to raise their rates because the price of diesel fuel has gone up so much. So the electrical rates of every consumer, every household in Omaha, is going to have double digit inflation on their electric bill.

Please, Mr. Speaker, let the madness stop. Let's do a real energy bill.

## THEY PUT US IN THIS SITUATION

(Mr. MORAN of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, for the last 8 years, our President and Vice President the founder of Bush Oil Exploration and the former CEO of Halliburton, the world's largest oil servicing firm, have had this country focused almost exclusively on drilling for fossil fuels, the use of oil and gas to power our economy. This administration issued 40,000 permits for drilling on public land onshore, and made 300 million acres offshore available to oil and gas companies. They still have 68 million acres of proven reserves that they are not drilling on.

But what is the focus now? Let's go after that last remaining 20 percent, even though it's the most environmentally sensitive, even though it will devastate the tourism industry and fishing industry of several states. Let's go after that. That's the answer. Forget the fact that we opposed research into solar power, cutting it by 80 percent, cutting wind power research and opposing more fuel efficient engines.

They put us in this situation, and now they want more of the same. And they're wrong.

## A RESPONSIBLE ENERGY POLICY MUST INCLUDE SOLAR TAX CREDITS

(Ms. GIFFORDS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GIFFORDS. There are three big problems that face America today. First, our dependence on foreign oil; second, climate change; and third,

America's innovation and the fact that we are not as competitive as this country needs to be. One of the best solutions to these three major problems is solar energy.

The investment tax credit, Mr. Speaker, the ITC, will expire at the end of the year. At home in southern Arizona and across this great Nation, free energy radiates from the sky almost every day of the year. Across my district, residents, businesses, utilities, and individuals are all working to do their part to take advantage of that sunshine. But major projects, large projects, but also small projects, will not move forward without the extension of the ITC.

Southern Arizonans are willing to do their part. We here in Congress have to do ours by working across party lines and working in the Senate to ensure that the ITC is extended. This is critical for our country, for our competitiveness, for climate change, and for ending our dependency on foreign oil.

I urge my colleagues to work together to pass the ITC.

## HOUSE DEMOCRATS CONTINUE TO SUPPORT BILLS THAT PROVIDE AMERICANS RELIEF AT THE PUMP

(Mr. STUPAK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, back in 2003, congressional Republicans supported the Bush-Cheney energy bill that was written in secret by Big Oil. And, boy, are we paying.

Three years later, we have record prices for consumers and record profits for the oil companies. Since taking control of Congress last year, Democrats have worked hard to reverse these failed energy policies.

For the first time in 32 years, we increased the fuel efficiency standards for vehicles so they will be more efficient, which will save Americans about \$1,000 a year. We also made a historic commitment to investing in biofuels and increasing domestic oil supply and drill responsibly.

This is a good start, but more needs to be done. That's why House Democrats brought eight pieces of legislation up in July to cut the high cost of gas, and Republicans opposed every one of those bills.

Mr. Speaker, it's time for House Republicans to work with us Democrats to provide the American people lower costs at the pump and lower costs in the grocery store by ending the excessive Wall Street speculation in our energy markets and increasing our energy and food costs. Mr. Speaker, it's time to end the manipulation of prices by Wall Street and the excessive speculation, to lower prices and save this American economy.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair

declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 35 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1220

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SALAZAR) at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3667, MISSISQUOI AND TROUT RIVERS WILD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY ACT OF 2008

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1419 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

##### H. RES. 1419

*Resolved*, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3667) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of the Missisquoi and Trout Rivers in the State of Vermont for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill pursuant to Part II of House Report 110-668. That committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against that committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to that committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amend-

ment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. During consideration in the House of H.R. 3667 pursuant to this resolution, notwithstanding the operation of the previous question, the Chair may postpone further consideration of the bill to such time as may be designated by the Speaker.

SEC. 3. House Resolution 1399 is laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Vermont is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Washington, my friend, Mr. HASTINGS. All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend remarks on House Resolution 1419.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

H. Res. 1419 provides for the consideration of H.R. 3667, the Missisquoi and Trout Rivers Wild and Scenic Study Act of 2008, under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate controlled by the Committee on Natural Resources, makes in order three amendments printed in the Rules Committee report, and provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairman RAHALL and Representative GRIJALVA, Ranking Members YOUNG and BISHOP for helping to bring this bill to the floor today. And I would like to thank the staff of the Natural Resources Committee for their very hard work on a bill that is of great importance to my State of Vermont.

The Missisquoi and Trout Rivers are two of the most beautiful rivers in the most beautiful State in the Nation, and that, with all due respect to the man from Washington, I claim to be the State of Vermont. These rivers are bordered by the largest and perhaps the highest quality silver maple floodplain forest remaining in our State of Vermont. They are also home to diverse animal life, including brook trout, rare freshwater mussels, and spiny soft shell turtles. It's a favorite walking, hiking, fishing area for many people in northern Vermont and, indeed, from Upstate New York and all around Vermont.

Additionally, the Missisquoi River is part of this extraordinary 740-mile northern forest canoe trail, which is

home to some of the best flat-water canoeing in Vermont and in the Northeast. Both of these rivers are highly valued by the surrounding towns and the communities. It has great recreational areas, swimming pools, and boating. Vermont parents that grew up swimming in these rivers take their kids back there, and it's a place in Vermont of just extraordinary scenic and natural beauty.

The bill, as these study bills all do, provides for a study of the two rivers, and it represents a first step toward protecting Abenaki Indian archeological sites along the flood plains, protecting scenic waterfalls and gorges, and a way of life that has been in these communities surrounding the two rivers for generations.

Passage of the rule will allow the Missisquoi and Trout Rivers Wild and Scenic River Study Act to be considered on the floor by the full body, and I urge support of this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, my colleague has spoken at length about the reasons—though not as long as I thought he would, let's put it that way—why he believes these stretches of the river in Vermont to be studied for the designation as Wild and Scenic, and it's very clear that he strongly believes in this bill to enact this study. He obviously has a great deal of love for his State when he challenges all of the other 49 States as not being as beautiful, at least indirectly, as Vermont. And I would just point out to him that in my State we have so much geographic diversity as far as beauty is concerned, from one area of the State where we have more rainfall than anyplace in a country—I'm not talking about Seattle; I'm talking about the Olympic Peninsula—to the area where I live, which is a desert area that has in some areas where I live less than 7 inches of rain. So I invite my friend any time he wants to come out to see what real beauty is in a short period of time, and he may want to ask me up there and I might respond to that.

But having said all of that, Mr. Speaker, I believe it's fair to say that the American people, frankly, are far less concerned about the rivers in Vermont and are far more concerned about the high price of gasoline and the fact that Congress is not acting right now on real solutions to lower energy costs.

The House of Representatives will spend over 2½ hours today discussing rivers in Vermont but not 1 minute,

Mr. Speaker, not 1 minute, on actual legislation to lower the price of gasoline. I really believe that the priorities of this Congress since we have come back from the 5-week August vacation are wrong. High gas and energy prices are hurting American workers and it's hurting our Nation's economy.

□ 1230

With jobs at stake, Mr. Speaker, this Congress twiddles its thumbs and busies itself once again, as we did earlier in the year, naming post offices and, today, studying the value of rivers in Vermont, in all deference to my friend from Vermont.

Mr. Speaker, this House should be permitted to have a "yes" or "no" vote on legislation to expand alternative energy sources and to lift the ban on drilling offshore, both coasts, Mr. Speaker, and in ANWR and other Alaskan lands in Alaska. But, unfortunately, the liberal leaders in this Congress have blocked, up to this point have blocked, a fair "yes" or "no" vote for months because I believe, Mr. Speaker, and I believe the majority of Members of this body knows that if we were to put the all-of-the-above energy plan up for a vote, that a majority of this House would vote for it. But we have been denied that opportunity time after time after time. Instead, they voted to go on a 5-week vacation in August to avoid working to lower gas prices, to protect American jobs, to make our Nation more energy independent.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that during that time since the adjournment for the 5-week vacation, a number of my Republican colleagues, 136 of my Republican colleagues, were here every day for several hours a day, trying to attempt to call the ask the Speaker to call Congress back in session. Unfortunately, that didn't happen. So now we are back here again on a regularly scheduled basis, and we will certainly have an opportunity to have a vote on the all-of-the-above, and I will talk about that more later.

But, Mr. Speaker, in the past, in the past, Senator BARACK OBAMA, Senator JOE BIDEN, Senator HARRY REID, and Speaker NANCY PELOSI, they are the leaders of the Democrat Party here in the U.S. Congress. Yet the one thing, other than being Democrat leaders, the one thing they all have in common, Mr. Speaker, is that they have in the past always opposed offshore drilling and drilling in Alaska. I think the majority of the Americans feel contrary to that view. And they fight and block any action on that at every turn. They refuse to act and to allow a vote on a drilling and alternative energy plan that would ultimately lower gas prices.

To me, Mr. Speaker, I just simply have to say in this election year that it's clear that liberalism has been put ahead of the need to help American workers and families struggling with high gas prices. We need to end the stranglehold that they have on Amer-

ica's ability to produce more of its own energy and on American jobs and the economy. And we can do that, Mr. Speaker, very simply by opening the resources that we have in this country. We need to change their no, no, no stance on producing more American energy.

This Congress, Mr. Speaker, and we all know this, needs to vote on the all-of-the-above energy plan. In that plan it includes promoting alternative energy sources, like wind and solar power. I might add parenthetically, Mr. Speaker, that we have a nuclear plant in my district, we have hydro plants in my district, and we have wind machines in my district. I am all in favor of all of the above, and our all-of-the-above energy plan includes precisely that.

This plan recognizes the need for more nuclear power. As I mentioned, I have a nuclear power plant in my district. Of course, it protects the value of hydropower, and that is the most abundant energy source for us in the Northwest. But it also allows, while we transition to a new energy source in the future, it allows drilling offshore and in Alaska and on other Federal lands.

Mr. Speaker, it really is time for the liberal leaders of this Congress to stop blocking a vote on producing more American-made energy. It's time for Members of Congress to stop hiding and to start voting.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that we are not elected to avoid taking positions on tough issues. We are elected to stand up and resolve those tough issues for the American people. So it's time for Congress to set aside naming post offices; in deference, again, to my friend from Vermont, studying rivers. It's time to get serious about addressing the high cost of gasoline and voting yes or no on real solutions, including drilling offshore and in Alaska.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I am the last speaker on our side, so I will reserve my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is the last speaker, and he is prepared to close. I know I have several Members that have asked for time. So, Mr. Speaker, I will yield myself such time as I may consume until other Members come to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned just briefly in my remarks that after the adjournment prior to the 5-week vacation and, by the way, that adjournment resolution was passed on a straight partisan vote. Every Republican voted against it because we felt we needed to stay here to help resolve the energy problem rather than go on a 5-week vacation. But there were a number of Members, I can mention 136 Members, that came down here and talked about the need for energy.

During that time, Mr. Speaker, the lights were off here, the microphones were off, and the cameras were off. Yet

there were a number of tourists, as we always have coming through the U.S. Capitol, their Capitol, and they were invited to sit on the floor and talk with us, interact with Members that came down and spoke.

The 2 days that I was here, and I admit I was only here 2 of those days, the last 2 days, and I had private conversations with a number of tourists that came through here. I have to say they were not from the Northwest, although there were some from the Northwest, but there were some from the South, and they were all kind of perplexed as to why the people's House, the House of Representatives, probably the genius part of our Founding Fathers in making a representative body, of which all Members that have served there, and there are slightly over 11,000 Members that have served in this body and, Mr. Speaker, every one, every one of those Members have been elected to this House. There has never been a Member that was appointed to the U.S. House of Representatives.

Now why do I say this in the context of energy prices? The genius of our Founding Fathers was that the House of Representatives and the fact that every one was elected is probably more in tune to what the people's wishes are across the country.

And so they were, frankly, the people I talked to, perplexed. Well, if this is the people's House, why haven't you had the opportunity to have a vote, just a vote up or down, recognizing, listen, we know that a majority rules, and I am prepared to take the consequences of that if my position on any issue fails to get a majority vote. I recognize that. I think every Member of Congress understands that. But to not have the opportunity, not have the opportunity to even vote, even vote on a proposal, really perplexes the tourists that came through here the 2 days I was on the floor.

In talking to my other colleagues, some of whom were down here as many as 13 days, and more, they had what I would say were similar experiences with their conversations with people that came through here.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned that my district is the district that in central Washington that is a center of virtually—I won't say all, but a great deal—of electricity that is produced in the Pacific Northwest. Within my district, for example, probably the hydroelectric facility that most Americans can associate with is Grand Coulee Dam. Half of that dam is in my district and the other half is in my colleague's from the Fifth District, CATHY MCMORRIS RODGERS' district.

But, in addition to that, I have up to 10 dams that are wholly within my district or I share with other Members of Congress, including my friend and colleague from across the river in Oregon, GREG WALDEN. There are three dams there where we share half of those dams.

That produces about 70 percent of the electricity in the northwest. It is renewable, Mr. Speaker. It is absolutely renewable, and we need to expand that, and a portion of expanding hydropower is in the all-of-the-above energy plan I talked about earlier that we have been denied a vote on. We have been denied a vote on.

Furthermore, I mentioned that I have wind plants in my district. Because generally in areas that I mentioned earlier on, that there was not a whole lot of rainfall in certain parts of my district, but the wind does blow. Now the wind, of course, is only good if the wind blows. But if the wind blows, it adds to the other facilities, like hydro, like hydro, or like nuclear. And I have a nuclear plant in my district.

What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that my constituents are well aware that we need to have a diverse energy portfolio. Without having an opportunity in the people's House to at least address the issue of all of the above, seems to me to be contrary, seems to me to be contrary to what this Congress is all about, and indeed what the House of Representatives is all about as it was envisioned by the Founders.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I have talked about what we did in August, and I have talked about the fact that up until August, and now we have a new session coming in after the break, that the Democrats have blocked and blocked any vote on lifting the ban.

But I have heard during the break that there are a number of brave Democrats who I think went home, talked to their constituents, and find out that their constituents were saying we need to become more energy independent. As a result, they proclaim that they support now offshore drilling to increase the supply of gasoline and oil and to make America more energy independent.

Well, listen. To all of my colleagues that maybe during the August break and having listened to their colleagues or to their constituents at home, I have a very positive message for you, and I have an opportunity for you, because by voting against the previous question, Mr. Speaker, all of my colleagues can prove that you are supporters of drilling and producing American-made energy. Of course, if you do not, that means that you side, of course, with Speaker PELOSI and you oppose drilling.

By defeating the previous question, Mr. Speaker, I will move to amend the rule to make in order H.R. 6566, the American Energy Act, and I have talked at length about what it is. This bill will reduce the price at the pump by enacting an all-of-the-above energy strategy. Once again, what it does, it increases the supply of American-made energy by using environmentally sound technology and innovations. It does so by improving conservation and efficiency and, Mr. Speaker, it promotes a diversity by renewing alternative energy sources, like wind that I had talked about, and solar.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of the amendment and extraneous material inserted into the RECORD prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I again ask my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question so that Congress, as they return from the 5-week recess—vacation, in some people's terms—and begin the work here in the fall before the election, so that we can finally vote, Mr. Speaker, on real solutions to the real and painful problem of high gas and energy prices.

American workers and families are hurting. Congress can help, can help today by voting on and passing this legislation, the American Energy Act.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's time to show whether you're really for lowering gas prices or whether you will continue to vote in lockstep with those against lifting the ban on offshore drilling and promoting alternative energy.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the previous question.

With that, I yield back my time.

□ 1245

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am shocked that my friend from Washington would question my assertions about the beauty of Vermont, and I will invite the Member from Washington to come to Vermont so I can let you firsthand experience the evidence that I have had so much opportunity to observe myself.

By the way, I have been to Washington. I climbed Mt. Rainier three times and was out on the San Juan Islands.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. For bragging about Washington, yes, I will.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Well, of course I am going to do that. And, listen: Mt. Rainier I can see from my district on a clear day, because it is 14,410 feet high. But it is quite a view when you view it from a desert setting. So I invite you the next time you come back to come over to my district for all the great wines, where the wine grapes are grown, by the way. And I understand my friend likes to have a cold beer once in a while. The taste of that beer comes from the hops that are grown in my district.

So, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend yielding on that basis, and I look forward to his visit. I appreciate it and yield back to him.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Thank you, my friend from Washington. We better get back to the focus at hand, because now Vermont quality beer has been challenged as well as the beauty of Vermont rivers. So we will just call

this part of the debate a draw and proceed.

Two things in response to comments made by my friend from Washington. Number one, it appears that there are no reservations or no stated objections to the study itself that is, frankly, quite important to Vermont. This is a very special part of our State that has the opportunity with the benefit of this study to be preserved for generations ahead, just as it has been cared for and enjoyed by generations in the past. So it is a very, very serious issue to the folks in Vermont. It is just a very special place.

The gentleman has not raised any specific objections. His objections are more in the nature of spending time on this instead of spending time on something else. So I would urge the Members to take that into account when they are voting on the previous question.

Second, I will address the energy arguments. This has been the refrain on the part of our friends on the other side as a response to every piece of business that we are doing on behalf of the American people. I think it has become apparent that this has become much more of a political debate than it has been an effort substantively to solve a very, very serious problem. Let me give a little commentary about that.

Number one, my friends on the other side have been in control of this institution and had the Presidency and the control of Congress for the past 12 years, until this Congress, and had an opportunity to enact comprehensive energy legislation when it was quite apparent to the American people that the problem of our excessive dependence on oil was a real and urgent problem.

They did nothing. In fact, the energy act they passed quite astonishingly provided taxpayer incentives, tax deductions, tax credits, to oil companies that were enjoying record profits. It is a mature industry, it is a profitable industry, yet the energy policy that was pursued and failed by our friends on the other side during the 12 years they were in charge basically was to give oil companies more taxpayer money.

It made no sense. There was no effort to use the power they had of the majority to bring to the floor legislation that would promote alternative energy. There was no effort to take the power that they had and provide tax incentives for the alternative energy industries that we know we must support if we are going to reduce and ultimately eliminate our dependence on foreign oil.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Would the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I won't yield. My intention, my friend from Washington, is to respond and bring this to a close, thank you.

So, number one, we are hearing objections from people who when they had the power to do the things they



claim they want to do, didn't use the power they had to accomplish those objectives.

Number two, when we have brought forward legislation and passed it, it has been with their objection. And what they claim they want to do are many things that we did over their objection. I will give a few examples.

To deal with the short-term price pressure at the pump and with home heating oil, this House of Representatives passed legislation that I sponsored to stop filling up the Strategic Petroleum Reserve and take off some of the demand on oil. That has contributed to helping bring down the price of gas at the pump by 5 to 25 cents a gallon.

Secondly, this House of Representatives has gotten tough on speculators. The evidence is overwhelming that part of the runup in the price of gasoline when it was heading up to \$150 a barrel was because of the speculative control and influence of hedge funds in foreign trading operations. We brought to this floor legislation, and just the fact that we did it finally, when it was ignored and accepted and mollified by our friends who were in control for 12 years, has helped bring down that speculative premium.

There is no justification for any one of our constituents when they pay for a gallon of gasoline or a gallon of home heating oil or a cubic gallon of natural gas to have included in their price a speculation premium for profiteers, and this Congress passed legislation to challenge that, against the opposition of our friends on the other side. So we have taken very specific actions to try to do what we reasonably can do to bring down the price pressure that is ripping off the American consuming public.

Second, we have passed energy legislation that is comprehensive, again over the opposition of our friends on the other side. One of the things we did was provided for tax credits for the alternative energy industry. We have to do that. That is of urgent, vital economic and environmental concern to this country.

We passed legislation that took away the tax breaks that are going to oil companies. There is no basis whatsoever to ask the taxpayer to pad the profits of a mature and profitable industry. They don't need it. They are doing quite well without additional taxpayer money to their bottom line.

But the new industries, the alternative energies that my friend from Washington mentioned, wind and solar, geothermal and biomass, they do need a boost, and historically when we have been at our best is when we have had the wisdom to use tax policy in a targeted and focused way to give a boost to these emerging industries and technologies that are good for the American economy and good for our environment, and that is what we need to do.

We have passed this in the House several times. Our friends on the other

side opposed it. Our friends in the Senate won't move on it. We are prepared to do it again. But the suggestion that has been made repetitively, over and over again, that the leadership of the Democratic Party in the House of Representatives is standing in the way of energy policy is flat out wrong. It is flat out false. Why is it being offered? It is being offered for political purposes, I would suggest.

Now, let me tell you this: That although we have passed comprehensive energy legislation several times in this House, although each time we have done it we have had to overcome the opposition of our friends on the other side, and although every time we bring up a legitimate piece of legislation that is part of the public business that this Congress must conduct, whether it is a study on the Missisquoi River, an energy bill or any other bill, every time we do our friends try to cease the debate and distort what has happened, we are prepared, as the gentleman from Washington knows, we in the Democratic Party, our leadership is prepared to bring up yet another comprehensive energy bill that does include all of the above.

The fact is, on our side we have passed all of the above time and time again, against the opposition of our friends on the other side, and then it has run into a brick wall in the other body or the steadfast opposition of the President of the United States. But the gentleman from Washington is aware that the leadership is prepared to bring up yet another bill to give us another opportunity to do the right thing.

Let me say this: I actually think it would be great to work together with the other side. I come from a State where we shift majorities back and forth. Sometimes the Democrats were in control, sometimes the Republican were in control. I was the senate president and I was the minority leader. I learned that in order for us ever to get anything done, we had to ultimately work together. I also came to understand that neither side had an absolute claim that they were the only people who had a good point of view, who had an iron grip on truth.

I believe that it would be best for all of us if there was some willingness to try to work on the substance, rather than just use this as a political football, and my observation is that for whatever reason, it is tough to get to that point here in the House of Representatives in Washington.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I wouldn't yield, my friend, because I will be bringing this to a close.

I want to take the opportunity, as I must, when the assertions are made, falsely in my view, that the Democratic leadership is standing in the way of energy policy change, that is just flat-out wrong. The energy for energy reform has come from the leadership on the Democratic side. Frankly, it has

come from the American people, who are tired of a Congress that passed off as an energy policy giving more money to the oil companies.

We have to make a fundamental decision in this hyper-political atmosphere of a presidential election whether we want to continue politics as usual, which in my view is a dead end, or we want to work together to achieve what we know is important for the American people, that is, short-term relief for prices at the pump, and it is a long-term energy policy that frees us from the dependence on oil from foreign countries.

So, Mr. Speaker, having said that, let me just close by coming back to this very important bill. It is a study. It is not necessarily important for many other parts of the country. But one of the things that makes this Congress and this country great is mutual respect. When there is a disaster in the Gulf Coast, all States pull together to help out. When there is flooding in the Midwest, all States pull together. When there is an opportunity for a small State like Vermont to take a step with Wild and Scenic River study that will help us and help our citizens enjoy the beauty of our land, I seek the help of my colleagues to let us accomplish that goal.

It is my request and my urging that all Members vote "yes" on the previous question and on the rule.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS of Washington is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1419 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS OF WASHINGTON

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall, without intervention of any point of order, consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6566) to bring down energy prices by increasing safe, domestic production, encouraging the development of alternative and renewable energy, and promoting conservation. All points of order against the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the majority and minority leader, and (2) an amendment in the nature of a substitute if offered by the majority leader or his designee, which shall be considered as read and shall be separately debatable for 40 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

(The information contained herein was provided by Democratic Minority on multiple occasions throughout the 109th Congress.)

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Democratic majority agenda and a vote to allow the opposition, at least for the moment, to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.



Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311) describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

Because the vote today may look bad for the Democratic majority they will say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the definition of the previous question used in the Floor Procedures Manual published by the Rules Committee in the 109th Congress (page 56). Here's how the Rules Committee described the rule using information from Congressional Quarterly's "American Congressional Dictionary": "If the previous question is defeated, control of debate shifts to the leading opposition member (usually the minority Floor Manager) who then manages an hour of debate and may offer a germane amendment to the pending business."

Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Democratic majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, my understanding is it is my opportunity now to yield back the balance of my time and move the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

# AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO ENTERTAIN MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES RELATING TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 1420 ON LEGISLATIVE DAY OF THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 2008

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be authorized to entertain motions to suspend the rules relating to House Resolution 1420 on the legislative day of Thursday, September 11, 2008.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed. Votes will be taken in the following order: ordering the previous question on H. Res. 1419, by the yeas and nays; adoption of H. Res. 1419, if ordered; motions to suspend the rules on H.R. 1527 and Senate bill 2617, by the yeas and nays.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

## PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3667, MISSISQUOI AND TROUT RIVERS WILD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on H. Res. 1419, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 189, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 576]

YEAS—224

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Allen  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Arcuri  
Baca  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Bean  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Boren  
Bowwell  
Boucher  
Boyd (FL)  
Boyd (KS)  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (IA)  
Brown, Corrine  
Butterfield

Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson  
Castor  
Chandler  
Clarke  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis, Lincoln

DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle  
Edwards (MD)  
Edwards (TX)  
Ellison  
Ellsworth  
Emanuel  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Foster  
Frank (MA)  
Giffords  
Gillibrand  
Gonzalez  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene

Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hall (NY)  
Hare  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Heller  
Hereth Sandlin  
Higgins  
Hinchey  
Hirono  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley  
Hoyer  
Inslie  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kagen  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind  
Klein (FL)  
Kucinich  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Loeback  
Lofgren, Zoe  
Lowey  
Lynch  
Mahoney (FL)  
Maloney (NY)  
Markey  
Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum (MN)  
McDermott

McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNerney  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Mitchell  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Neal (MA)  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Pallone  
Pascarelli  
Pastor  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Price (NC)  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reichert  
Reyes  
Richardson  
Rodriguez  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Salazar  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes

Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Serrano  
Sestak  
Shays  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shuler  
Sires  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Space  
Speier  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stupak  
Sutton  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
 Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch (VT)  
Wexler  
Wilson (OH)  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Yarmuth

NAYS—189

Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barrett (SC)  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)  
Biggart  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Boehner  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boozman  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Broun (GA)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Buchanan  
Burton (IN)  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp (MI)  
Campbell (CA)  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carter  
Castle  
Chabot  
Childers  
Coble  
Cole (OK)  
Conaway  
Crenshaw  
Cubin  
Culberson  
Davis (KY)  
Davis, David  
Deal (GA)  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.

Diaz-Balart, M.  
Donnelly  
Doolittle  
Drake  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Ehlers  
Emerson  
English (PA)  
Everett  
Fallin  
Feeney  
Flake  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fossella  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Gilchrest  
Gingrey  
Gohmert  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Granger  
Graves  
Hall (TX)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Hill  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hunter  
Inglis (SC)  
Issa  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Jordan  
Keller  
King (IA)  
King (NY)

Kingston  
Kirk  
Kline (MN)  
Knollenberg  
Kuhl (NY)  
LaHood  
Lamborn  
Lampson  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
LoBiondo  
Lucas  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Mack  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCaul (TX)  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McHenry  
McHugh  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Moran (KS)  
Murphy, Tim  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Paul  
Pearce  
Pence  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Platts

Poe  
Price (GA)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Radanovich  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Renzi  
Reynolds  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Roskam  
Royce  
Ryan (WI)  
Sali

Saxton  
Scalise  
Schmidt  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Souder  
Stearns  
Sullivan  
Tancredo  
Terry  
Tiahrt

Tiberi  
Turner  
Upton  
Walberg  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh (NY)  
Wamp  
Weldon (FL)  
Weller  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield (KY)  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman (VA)  
Wolf  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—20

Baird  
Burgess  
Cannon  
Cazayoux  
Davis, Tom  
Ferguson  
Gordon

Hinojosa  
Hodes  
Hulshof  
Kennedy  
Lee  
Levin  
McNulty

Peterson (MN)  
Pitts  
Ramstad  
Scott (VA)  
Sensenbrenner  
Thornberry

## □ 1325

Messrs. KINGSTON, WITTMAN of Virginia, HALL of Texas, and EHLERS changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 223, nays 190, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 577]

## YEAS—223

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Allen  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Arcuri  
Baca  
Baldwin  
Barrow  
Bean  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd (FL)  
Boyda (KS)  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown, Corrine  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson  
Castor  
Chandler  
Childers  
Clarke  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen

Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis, Lincoln  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLauro  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly  
Doyle  
Edwards (MD)  
Edwards (TX)  
Ellison  
Ellsworth  
Emanuel  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Foster  
Frank (MA)  
Giffords  
Gillibrand  
Gonzalez  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene

Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Hall (NY)  
Hare  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)  
Herseth Sandlin  
Higgins  
Hinchey  
Hirono  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley  
Hoyer  
Inslie  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kagen  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind  
Kirk  
Klein (FL)  
Kucinich  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren, Zoe

Lowey  
Lynch  
Mahoney (FL)  
Maloney (NY)  
Markey  
Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum (MN)  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McNerney  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Mitchell  
Mollohan  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murtha  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Pallone

Pascrell  
Pastor  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Pomeroy  
Price (NC)  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reyes  
Richardson  
Rodriguez  
Ross  
Rothman  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Salazar  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Serrano  
Sestak  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shuler  
Sires  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder

## NAYS—190

Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Barrett (SC)  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)  
Biggart  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (UT)  
Blackburn  
Blunt  
Boehner  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boozman  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Broun (GA)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Buchanan  
Burton (IN)  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp (MI)  
Campbell (CA)  
Cantor  
Capito  
Carter  
Castle  
Chabot  
Coble  
Cole (OK)  
Conaway  
Crenshaw  
Cubin  
Culberson  
Davis (KY)  
Davis, David  
Davis, Tom  
Deal (GA)  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Doolittle  
Drake  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Ehlers  
Emerson  
English (PA)  
Everett  
Fallin  
Feeney  
Ferguson  
Flake  
Forbes

Fortenberry  
Fossella  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Gilchrest  
Gingrey  
Gohmert  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Granger  
Graves  
Hall (TX)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Heller  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Hill  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Inglis (SC)  
Issa  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones (NC)  
Jordan  
Keller  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kingston  
Kline (MN)  
Knollenberg  
Kuhl (NY)  
LaHood  
Lamborn  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Linder  
LoBiondo  
Lucas  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Mack  
Manzullo  
Mancant  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCauley (TX)  
McCotter  
McCrery  
McHenry  
McHugh  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Rodgers

Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller, Gary  
Moran (KS)  
Murphy, Tim  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Paul  
Pearce  
Pence  
Petri  
Pickering  
Platts  
Poe  
Porter  
Price (GA)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Radanovich  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Renzi  
Reynolds  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Royce  
Ryan (WI)  
Sali  
Saxton  
Scalise  
Schmidt  
Sessions  
Shadegg  
Shays  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Souder  
Stearns  
Sullivan  
Tancredo  
Terry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Turner  
Upton  
Walberg  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh (NY)  
Wamp

Weldon (FL)  
Weller  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield (KY)

Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman (VA)  
Wolf

Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

## NOT VOTING—20

Baird  
Burgess  
Cannon  
Cazayoux  
Gordon  
Hinojosa  
Hodes

Hulshof  
Hunter  
Kennedy  
Lee  
Levin  
McNulty  
Peterson (MN)

Peterson (PA)  
Pitts  
Ramstad  
Scott (VA)  
Sensenbrenner  
Thornberry

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

## □ 1335

Mr. WELLER of Illinois changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. KIRK changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 577 and 576, had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on 577 and “yea” on 576.

## RURAL VETERANS ACCESS TO CARE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1527, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1527, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 417, nays 0, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 578]

## YEAS—417

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Allen  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Arcuri  
Baca  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Baldwin  
Barrett (SC)  
Barrow  
Bartlett (MD)  
Barton (TX)  
Bean  
Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Biggart  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Blumenauer

Blunt  
Boehner  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boozman  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boustany  
Boyd (FL)  
Boyda (KS)  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Braley (IA)  
Broun (GA)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown, Corrine  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Buchanan  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Butterfield  
Buyer  
Calvert  
Camp (MI)  
Campbell (CA)  
Cantor  
Capito

Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson  
Carter  
Castle  
Castor  
Chabot  
Chandler  
Childers  
Clarke  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coble  
Cohen  
Cole (OK)  
Conaway  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cubin

Cuellar	Jackson-Lee	Oberstar	Tiberi	Walsh (NY)	Westmoreland	Burton (IN)	Gonzalez	McCollum (MN)
Culberson	(TX)	Obey	Tierney	Walz (MN)	Wexler	Butterfield	Goode	McCotter
Cummings	Jefferson	Oliver	Towns	Wamp	Whitfield (KY)	Buyer	Goodlatte	McCrery
Davis (AL)	Johnson (GA)	Ortiz	Tsongas	Wasserman	Wilson (NM)	Calvert	Gordon	McDermott
Davis (CA)	Johnson (IL)	Pallone	Turner	Schultz	Wilson (OH)	Camp (MI)	Granger	McGovern
Davis (IL)	Johnson, E. B.	Pascarell	Udall (CO)	Waters	Wilson (SC)	Campbell (CA)	Graves	McHenry
Davis (KY)	Johnson, Sam	Pastor	Udall (NM)	Watson	Wittman (VA)	Cantor	Green, Al	McHugh
Davis, David	Jones (NC)	Paul	Upton	Watt	Wolf	Capito	Green, Gene	McIntyre
Davis, Lincoln	Jordan	Payne	Van Hollen	Waxman	Woolsey	Capps	Grijalva	McKeon
Davis, Tom	Kagen	Pearce	Velázquez	Weiner	Wu	Capuano	Gutierrez	McMorris
Deal (GA)	Kanjorski	Pence	Visclosky	Welch (VT)	Yarmuth	Cardoza	Hall (NY)	Rodgers
DeFazio	Kaptur	Perlmutter	Walberg	Weldon (FL)	Young (AK)	Carnahan	Hall (TX)	McNerney
DeGette	Keller	Peterson (PA)	Walden (OR)	Weller	Young (FL)	Carney	Hare	Meek (FL)
Delahunt	Kennedy	Petri				Carson	Harman	Meeks (NY)
DeLauro	Kildee	Pickering				Carter	Hastings (FL)	Mica
Dent	Kilpatrick	Platts	Baird	Hulshof	Pitts	Castle	Hastings (WA)	Michaud
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kind	Poe	Blackburn	Hunter	Scott (VA)	Castor	Hayes	Miller (FL)
Diaz-Balart, M.	King (IA)	Pomeroy	Cannon	Lee	Sensenbrenner	Chabot	Heller	Miller (MI)
Dicks	King (NY)	Porter	Cazayoux	Levin	Thornberry	Chandler	Hensarling	Miller (NC)
Dingell	Kingston	Price (GA)	Emerson	McNulty		Childers	Herger	Miller, Gary
Doggett	Kirk	Price (NC)	Hodes	Peterson (MN)		Clarke	Hersteth Sandlin	Miller, George
Donnelly	Klein (FL)	Pryce (OH)				Clay	Higgins	Mitchell
Doolittle	Kline (MN)	Putnam				Cleaver	Hill	Mollohan
Doyle	Knollenberg	Radanovich				Clyburn	Hinchey	Moore (KS)
Drake	Kucinich	Rahall				Coble	Hinojosa	Moore (WI)
Dreier	Kuhl (NY)	Ramstad				Cohen	Hirono	Moran (KS)
Duncan	LaHood	Rangel				Cole (OK)	Hobson	Moran (VA)
Edwards (MD)	Lamborn	Regula				Conaway	Hoekstra	Murphy (CT)
Edwards (TX)	Lampson	Rehberg				Conyers	Holden	Murphy, Patrick
Ehlers	Langevin	Reichert				Cooper	Holt	Murphy, Tim
Ellison	Larsen (WA)	Renzi				Costa	Honda	Murtha
Ellsworth	Larson (CT)	Reyes				Costello	Hooley	Musgrave
Emanuel	Latham	Reynolds				Courtney	Hoyer	Myrick
Engel	LaTourette	Richardson				Cramer	Hunter	Nadler
English (PA)	Latta	Rodriguez				Crenshaw	Inglis (SC)	Napolitano
Eshoo	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (AL)				Crowley	Inslee	Neal (MA)
Etheridge	Lewis (GA)	Rogers (KY)				Cubin	Israel	Neugebauer
Everett	Lewis (KY)	Rogers (MI)				Cuellar	Issa	Nunes
Fallin	Linder	Rohrabacher				Culberson	Jackson (IL)	Oberstar
Farr	Lipinski	Ros-Lehtinen				Cummings	Jackson-Lee	Obey
Fattah	LoBiondo	Roskam				Davis (AL)	(TX)	Oliver
Feeney	Loebsack	Ross				Davis (CA)	Jefferson	Ortiz
Ferguson	Loftgren, Zoe	Rothman				Davis (IL)	Johnson (GA)	Pallone
Filner	Lowe	Roybal-Allard				Davis (KY)	Johnson (IL)	Pascarell
Flake	Lucas	Royce				Davis, David	Johnson, E. B.	Pastor
Forbes	Lungren, Daniel	Ruppersberger				Davis, Lincoln	Johnson, Sam	Paul
Fortenberry	E.	Rush				Davis, Tom	Jones (NC)	Payne
Fossella	Lynch	Ryan (OH)				Deal (GA)	Jordan	Pearce
Foster	Mack	Ryan (WI)				DeFazio	Kagen	Pence
Foxx	Mahoney (FL)	Salazar				DeGette	Kanjorski	Perlmutter
Frank (MA)	Maloney (NY)	Sali				Delahunt	Kaptur	Peterson (PA)
Franks (AZ)	Manzullo	Sánchez, Linda				DeLauro	Keller	Petri
Frelinghuysen	Marchant	T.				Dent	Kennedy	Pickering
Gallegly	Markey	Sanchez, Loretta				Diaz-Balart, L.	Kildee	Platts
Garrett (NJ)	Marshall	Sarbanes				Diaz-Balart, M.	Kilpatrick	Poe
Gerlach	Matheson	Saxton				Dicks	Kind	Pomeroy
Giffords	Matsui	Scalise				Dingell	King (IA)	Porter
Gilchrest	McCarthy (CA)	Schakowsky				Doggett	King (NY)	Price (GA)
Gillibrand	McCarthy (NY)	Schiff				Donnelly	Kingston	Price (NC)
Gingrey	McCaul (TX)	Schmidt				Doolittle	Kirk	Pryce (OH)
Gohmert	McCollum (MN)	Schwartz				Doyle	Klein (FL)	Putnam
Gonzalez	McCotter	Scott (GA)				Drake	Kline (MN)	Radanovich
Goode	McCrery	Serrano				Dreier	Knollenberg	Rahall
Goodlatte	McDermott	Sessions				Duncan	Kucinich	Ramstad
Gordon	McGovern	Sestak				Edwards (MD)	Kuhl (NY)	Rangel
Granger	McHenry	Shadegg				Edwards (TX)	LaHood	Regula
Graves	McHugh	Shays				Ehlers	Lamborn	Rehberg
Green, Al	McIntyre	Shea-Porter				Ellison	Lampson	Reichert
Green, Gene	McKeon	Sherman				Ellsworth	Langevin	Renzi
Grijalva	McMorris	Shimkus				Emanuel	Larsen (WA)	Reyes
Gutierrez	Rodgers	Shuler				Emerson	Larson (CT)	Reynolds
Hall (NY)	McNerney	Shuster				Engel	Latham	Richardson
Hall (TX)	Meek (FL)	Simpson				English (PA)	LaTourette	Rodriguez
Hare	Meeks (NY)	Sires				Eshoo	Latta	Rogers (AL)
Harman	Melancon	Skelton				Etheridge	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (KY)
Hastings (FL)	Mica	Slaughter				Everett	Lewis (GA)	Rogers (MI)
Hastings (WA)	Michaud	Smith (NE)				Fallin	Lewis (KY)	Rohrabacher
Hayes	Miller (FL)	Smith (NJ)				Farr	Linder	Ros-Lehtinen
Heller	Miller (MI)	Smith (TX)				Fattah	Lipinski	Roskam
Hensarling	Miller (NC)	Smith (WA)				Feeney	LoBiondo	Ross
Herger	Miller, Gary	Snyder				Ferguson	Loebsack	Rothman
Hersteth Sandlin	Miller, George	Solis				Filner	Loftgren, Zoe	Roybal-Allard
Higgins	Mitchell	Souder				Flake	Lowe	Royce
Hill	Mollohan	Space				Forbes	Lucas	Ruppersberger
Hinchey	Moore (KS)	Speier				Fortenberry	Lungren, Daniel	Rush
Hinojosa	Moore (WI)	Spratt				Fossella	E.	Ryan (OH)
Hirono	Moran (KS)	Stark				Foster	Lynch	Ryan (WI)
Hobson	Moran (VA)	Stearns				Fox	Mack	Salazar
Hoekstra	Murphy (CT)	Stupak				Frank (MA)	Mahoney (FL)	Sali
Holden	Murphy, Patrick	Sullivan				Franks (AZ)	Maloney (NY)	Sánchez, Linda
Holt	Murphy, Tim	Sutton				Frelinghuysen	Manzullo	T.
Honda	Murtha	Tancred				Gallegly	Marchant	Sanchez, Loretta
Hooley	Musgrave	Tanner				Garrett (NJ)	Markey	Sarbanes
Hoyer	Myrick	Tauscher				Gerlach	Marshall	Saxton
Inglis (SC)	Nadler	Taylor				Giffords	Matheson	Scalise
Inslee	Napolitano	Terry				Gilchrest	Matsui	Schakowsky
Israel	Neal (MA)	Thompson (CA)				Gillibrand	McCarthy (CA)	Schiff
Issa	Neugebauer	Thompson (MS)				Gingrey	McCarthy (NY)	Schmidt
Jackson (IL)	Nunes	Tiahrt				Gohmert	McCaul (TX)	Schwartz

## NOT VOTING—16

□ 1343

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: “A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a pilot program to permit certain highly rural veterans enrolled in the health system of the Department of Veterans Affairs to receive covered health services through providers other than those of the Department.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 578, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

## VETERANS' COMPENSATION COST-OF-LIVING ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALTMIRE). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2617, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2617.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 418, nays 0, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 579]

YEAS—418

Abercrombie	Bean	Boozman
Ackerman	Becerra	Boren
Aderholt	Berkley	Boswell
Akin	Berman	Boucher
Alexander	Berry	Boustany
Allen	Biggart	Boyd (FL)
Altmire	Billbray	Boyd (KS)
Andrews	Billirakis	Brady (PA)
Arcuri	Bishop (GA)	Brady (TX)
Baca	Bishop (NY)	Braley (IA)
Bachmann	Bishop (UT)	Broun (GA)
Bachus	Blackburn	Brown (SC)
Baldwin	Blumenauer	Brown, Corrine
Barrett (SC)	Blunt	Brown-Waite,
Barrow	Boehner	Ginny
Bartlett (MD)	Bonner	Buchanan
Barton (TX)	Bono Mack	Burgess

Scott (GA)  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sestak  
Shadegg  
Shays  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Solis  
Souder  
Space  
Speier  
Spratt  
Stark

Stearns  
Stupak  
Sullivan  
Sutton  
Tancredo  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walberg  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh (NY)

Walz (MN)  
Wamp  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch (VT)  
Weldon (FL)  
Westmoreland  
Wexler  
Whitfield (KY)  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (OH)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman (VA)  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Yarmuth  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)

□ 1354

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3667) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of the Missisquoi and Trout Rivers in the State of Vermont for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, with Mr. SALAZAR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

H.R. 3667, the Missisquoi and Trout Rivers Wild and Scenic River Study Act, was introduced by our colleague from Vermont, Representative WELCH. This bill would amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to authorize the National Park Service to study specific sections of the Missisquoi and Trout Rivers in Vermont for their potential inclusion into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

I want to thank our colleague from Vermont, Congressman WELCH, for his hard work on this measure. This is a good piece of legislation, which will help showcase the natural heritage of Vermont.

We are coming upon the 40th anniversary of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act in October. It's important to celebrate the legacy of this act, the preservation of some of our wildest rivers and the safeguarding of our scenic waterways for generations to come, and to acknowledge the essential role that stewardship and a conservation ethic play in the management of our Nation's rivers and streams.

The Missisquoi is a tributary of Lake Champlain, located in northern Vermont. The Trout is a tributary of the Missisquoi. With its headwaters in Lowell, Vermont, the Missisquoi extends almost 100 miles, flowing north into Quebec, then returning to Vermont to flow west before finally ending its journey at Lake Champlain.

As it runs its course through open pastoral fields, scenic gorges and native hardwood forests, the river is a remarkable example of a northeastern ecosystem. It is bordered by the largest and perhaps highest quality silver maple floodplain forest remaining in the State of Vermont. American elm, white ash, white oak, and red maple are found along its banks.

The river is home to diverse fish and wildlife, including native rainbow and brown trout, rare freshwater mussels, spiny soft-shell turtles and river otter. While on the river's banks, bobcat,

white-tailed deer, and moose can sometimes be spotted, and the surrounding marshes host large flocks of migratory birds.

In addition to these natural qualities, there are numerous Abenaki Indian archeological sites along the floodplain.

And the river is well-known for its outstanding recreational opportunities as well. It is part of the Northern Forest Canoe Trail—a historic 740-mile water trail through New York, Vermont, Quebec, New Hampshire, and Maine—and outfitters consider the northern part of the river to be the pre-eminent flat-water paddling spot in Vermont.

It is also renowned for its waterfalls, and the Great Falls on the upper river is recognized as Vermont's largest undammed waterfall.

Simply put, this river is a superb illustration of Vermont's postcard perfect national scenery.

During a hearing on this bill, the administration testified in support of the bill, but recommended that changes be made to clearly specify which segments should be included in the study, as not all of the sections of the river in the original bill were appropriate for consideration. They recommended other technical changes as well.

The Natural Resources Committee amended the bill to respond to those recommendations and clarified which sections of the river would be studied for the wild and scenic attributes.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3667 simply authorizes a study of this river. It is a preliminary step, not a final designation.

Its enactment would simply trigger a process which will allow the National Park Service the opportunity to gather information from, listen to, and coordinate with State officials and local communities; with farmers, business owners, and river outfitters; and with hunters, anglers, birders, paddlers, and hikers—all those who value this river. Only then, after careful consideration and with input from all the stakeholders, will the National Park Service provide recommendations to Congress about the potential of this river.

That is all the legislation does. It is that simple. Let's not lose sight of what this bill is about.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3667.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1400

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and it will be quite awhile.

Well, Mr. Chairman, here we are in a 15-day session. We're now one-fifth of the way through our final session before we end. The Democrat leaders, who have set the agenda and run this floor for almost 2 years now, have had 5 weeks in preparation for this day. So the first issue of significance, the only issue we may have this week that has a rule, the most significant piece of

## NOT VOTING—15

Baird  
Cannon  
Cazayoux  
Hodes  
Hulshof

Lee  
Levin  
McNulty  
Melancon  
Peterson (MN)

Pitts  
Scott (VA)  
Sensenbrenner  
Thornberry  
Weller

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in the vote.

□ 1352

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 5977

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, DUNCAN HUNTER was mistakenly added to the list of cosponsors on H.R. 5977. I ask unanimous consent to have his name removed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material regarding H.R. 3667.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

## MISSISQUOI AND TROUT RIVERS WILD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1419 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 3667.

legislation we're talking about today is a study that, if passed, may perhaps someday, if conditions allow and the elements are conducive, possibly create a compromise that would might possibly pass an additional 70 miles being added to the inventory of the national government, and only costing the taxpayers \$300,000 to do it. That's what we're doing today.

I would like to make a couple of points about this particular bill, not necessarily in opposition to it. But one point that is significant; we talk a great deal in government about transparency. It's important to government to be transparent. It's good to be transparent—until it deals with how we treat people.

One of the things that the Republican Party has tried to do on almost every bill that has come either to committee or to the floor that deals with a trail, a heritage area, an historic area or a scenic river is to ensure that the people who will be involved in that area are informed up front about what may or may not happen to them. Because once we go to the next step and actually create this wild and scenic river, the Federal Government is given—not in this bill, but is given in the existing powers they have—the right of condemnation of any of that land that will be in that area. They have almost unlimited rights of easement. They always have the ability of dealing with local officials to create zoning ordinances that have a huge impact on the people in those areas.

Almost always these studies are done with small groups. And then citizens will come back to us afterwards and say we were unaware of what was actually happening at this time. The dairy farmers along this river—who may or may not need protection and may or may not be happy and satisfied with what will result to them—may or may not have any idea what will happen as they go through this study.

The first year I was here in Congress I passed a wilderness bill. I made sure that I went to every single property owner in that area that would be impacted by that wilderness bill, even the guy who was dead and had no heirs, which was a neat trick. But we went to every one of them to make sure they were well aware in advance of what was to take place. And yet when we tried to add an amendment, both in committee and once again before the Rules Committee, to make sure that everyone who may be impacted by this new designation and this study was made aware and they had to respond affirmatively that they wished to be part of the study, it was again rejected.

Why do we not treat Americans with respect? We will pass these types of provisions to empower government, but we will not ask the citizens who will be impacted by our decisions to be part of this particular process. It's something that used to be standard language that we would add to these types of provisions, and it should be added again. That's a flaw.

For 2 years Speaker PELOSI has been the one who was to set the agenda for our discussions here on the floor. One of those issues that I think people would like us to talk about is obviously energy. We have been talking about that for a long time. When this new leadership took over the House, on day one, when the energy prices started to climb and it was \$2.22, the topic of discussion we had on this floor was congratulating the University of California-Santa Barbara soccer team. When energy reached \$4 at the pump, I was here to spend a rollicking hour and a half talking about monkey bites. And today, after our 5-week adjournment, after people have been talking to us, after our constituents have said what is affecting them, after 5 weeks of preparation, what we are proposing to talk about today as the significant issue on the agenda is to study two rivers in Vermont. The only bill we will have with a rule, to study two rivers in Vermont.

And I hate to say this; I'm not opposed to it. There's no reason to be. It's fine. The bill is a nice bill. It can be improved significantly, but there's nothing wrong with it. The question is, why are we here talking about that after 5 weeks of getting prepared to talk about significant issues?

I had a couple of my constituents come to me. They said what they wanted to see Congress do is something in a bipartisan way; that we should come back here and show that we can work together. Indeed, the Senators have already told us that there is only a bipartisan energy plan of theirs, that's the only thing that can be passed, therefore, we should come together and support what they are trying to do in the spirit of bipartisanship, not only between two political parties, but between two branches of Congress. I am sure maybe someday this week we might even have another energy bill proposed for discussion on this floor, and I'm sure somebody will say this is the only thing we can pass; let us now embrace this in a spirit of bipartisanship so that we can show that we can work together.

Sometimes I have the feeling that we on this floor believe that if we toast one another or we slap one another on the back or we have congratulatory comity, that that, indeed, is the end of the discussion; that is the goal, not the means to reach some kind of discussion; when the end should be, have we solved the problem?

We have now had eight votes over 3 days on this floor, each of them getting around 400 plus votes. That is bipartisanship, that is comity, that is coming together. But have we solved what the needs of the American people are? Those eight votes, we've named three post offices, we said we're against hunger and we're for the Red Cross. That's good. But that does not solve the problems plaguing Americans.

If I was to go to a hospital and I was on the gurney being rushed into the

surgery room, is it logical that I would look up at the assembled doctors and nurses and say, "Look, when you open me up, I don't really care what you do inside just as long as you do it together in harmony, in a bipartisan way"? Or would it be much more logical for me to say, "Ladies and gentlemen, when you open me up, solve the problem"? And that is, indeed, what the American people are looking at us to do here today is not necessarily find out how many bills we can pass on suspension, how much comity we can have, but how we can solve the problem.

To simply pass a political statement does not make a difference to individuals. We are supposed to be here to try and solve the problem. And it is very clear that the problem has to be some way in which we have an overarching, comprehensive energy proposal. That is the problem that we're facing. We need to come to this floor and actually encourage people to conserve, not by mandating conservation efforts, but by rewarding Americans for conservation efforts and they will take it from there.

We must come to the floor and finally realize that our problem is supply and demand, and that we have to increase production of that supply, that we do not have a logical pattern of funding alternative energy sources. But if we could actually increase the amount of oil and coal and oil shale and natural gas, that we could use the royalties this government would then create to actually fund a comprehensive energy program for alternative energies—for solar, for wind power, for anything else that happens to be there—if we simply decided to use an "all of the above" approach. We can solve our problem in the emergency, for the beginning, for the present time, as well as coming up with a long-term strategy for the future that actually would be funded.

We could finally realize that this country does not have an infrastructure that will allow energy to be moved from one part of the country to the other. There are good friends in New England who will face high costs of heating their homes this fall. We have a good pipeline that goes, but it stops before it ever gets to their part of the country.

We need to solve those problems. We need to make sure we have more refineries. We need to make sure we do something on the electric grid. And we are not. That is the solution to the problem for the American people.

We need to finally realize that the future of this country is not going to be solved by bringing experts into Washington to sit around a room and come up with an idea, but the ability of America to solve its problem rests with the people out there. Because within the American people, without their soul and heart, is the ability and the creativity to come up with real solutions if we just empower them to find those solutions and then reward them

for the creativity that they can expound.

We need to realize that the solution to our problem is that the next time we lose 84,000 jobs it is not exacerbated by the lack of energy; that the next time an airline doesn't have enough energy to run 100 planes, they don't have to fire 1,100 people because of it; that the cab driver in Washington, D.C. who now drives 2 hours extra every day because he needs that to provide enough funds for the new energy he has to provide could actually be back at home meeting his kids after school the way he used to; or that we provide enough energy in here so the father in Virginia can finally go with his son to a father and son outing; or the family in Maryland can finally have enough energy so they can re-enroll their daughters in dance and gymnastics; so that school kids in the middle of this country can finally make it to field trips this year; or the teachers in our districts throughout this country will not find their salaries to be depressed or in some cases slashed because of unusual and unexpected energy costs in their districts; so that home heating oil will not drive people out of existence; so the farmer in the field will have enough energy to put in diesel in his tractors to produce the food so that truckers will have enough energy to drive them to market so that the prices of food that we have to pick up at those markets will not be spiraling this winter and this next year. And all of those is what we should be talking about.

The river is nice; it's okay. The study is okay. But it is not where we should be at this particular time because it doesn't solve the problem.

There are a lot of rich people in this body. For them, this energy crisis is an annoyance. But for those people on fixed incomes, those people at the bottom of the scale, those people in the middle class, we're not talking to them about energy policy. We're talking about the way they cook their food, the way they heat their homes, whether they have a job or not.

Three days into the last 15 days of this session, and the most significant issue is a study bill on two rivers in Vermont. This country is aching for legislation that will nourish the body politic, and yet we continue to put up, day after day on this body, pieces of legislation that are as nutritional as cotton candy. We need to do it differently.

But, on the plus side, we will probably do this bill in a bipartisan way. Doesn't it make you feel proud?

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I'm encouraged by the newfound populism of my good friend from Utah. And I agree that a comprehensive approach to energy has to be something that this Congress accomplishes within the week. This does not negate what I believe to be a good piece of legislation that is before us.

And it is considerable work. We have to unravel 8 years of failed energy policies. We have to unravel the relationship between Big Oil and the administration so that the consumer, the average Joe out there, will get the kind of break and attention that he needs and she needs with regard to energy costs and the rising cost all around us.

Having said that, let me now turn to the sponsor of this good piece of legislation, the gentleman from Vermont, Congressman WELCH, for as much time as he may consume.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I very much appreciate the excellent work you did and your eloquent description of a beautiful river. If I have any say about it, we're going to make you an honorary Vermonter and bring you down that river and make you paddle your way from one end to the other and have you see for yourself how beautiful what you described really is. Thank you.

I want to respond to some of the comments.

Mr. Chairman, my opinion is that one of the greatest Presidents of the United States was Theodore Roosevelt. He came to the Presidency when his predecessor was assassinated. It was a time of great turmoil, social and labor unrest, a need for corporate reform, trust busting. President Roosevelt had his hands full taking on those economic challenges.

He was a war President. The skirmish in Cuba and the Philippines were still very much alive, and he had to deal with that as President. Very serious issues with the Supreme Court. And in the midst of all of that he still found time to be a peacemaker and was the winner of the Nobel Prize for the work that he did in bringing together the Soviet and Japanese conflict and helping those folks resolve the end of that war.

But Theodore Roosevelt was also a person who respected and did more, perhaps, than anyone else to protect our environment. And amidst his responsibilities, where he had to simultaneously deal with enormous economic anxiety in this country, when he had to deal with foreign affairs that involved making America a strong country and bringing together peace in other countries, he would never, ever, busy as he was, urgent as his demands were, belittle the work of the House of Representatives when they were taking up what is now being characterized as a "waste-of-time bill" because it involves two rivers in the State of Vermont. He wouldn't do it. He's a bigger man than that.

He reflects the leadership that we can provide to the American people where we simultaneously take on the challenges, as President Roosevelt did, but also pay attention to the posterity that is our responsibility to leave behind.

I just want to say as a Vermonter, I want to say as a Member of the House of Representatives that if we can't find

time to do those things that are going to allow us in Utah, in Arkansas, in Arizona and in Vermont to save our rivers and to do what is going to preserve our country and leave behind legacies like President Teddy Roosevelt did with the National Park Service that we revere and enjoy, then we don't deserve the vote of confidence that we get from the folks who send us here. We can do both.

Now my friend from Utah has essentially made an argument that there is more important business to be done, as if that suggests we don't have time to do other important business about protecting and preserving our environment and having mutual respect for the particular concerns, in this case, of Vermont.

□ 1415

But it's that same comity that has allowed us to come forward and step up as Vermonters and Arizonans to help the folks in the Midwest from their flood and to respond to the gulf coast with the damage that they sustained. It's political. That's what we know.

The reality is our friends on the other side had 12 years in control here and their energy policy was one thing: give tax breaks to oil companies. You can't make that up. Oil companies are doing well. I don't begrudge them their profits. But why do you reach into the taxpayers' pocket and ask taxpayers to give the most profitable corporations in the world, running a mature industry, doing well, why do we ask the taxpayers to give them \$13 billion? When you reveal that fact, they don't even know how to respond because you can't make that kind of stuff up.

So this House of Representatives, under the leadership that now is being castigated for a failure of leadership, has repeatedly passed legislation against the objections, almost unanimous, of our friends on the other side, to stop filling up the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, to squeeze out the speculative premium in the price of a gallon of gas at the pump. That can provide some short-term relief. We did that. We passed comprehensive energy reform, again, against the objections of our friends on the other side. We took away the tax breaks from the oil companies, not because oil companies are a target. They're doing important work. They know how to do their work and they know how to do it well. But why in the world would our friends on the other side want to give \$13 billion in tax breaks to a mature and profitable industry when that money comes directly out of the pockets of American consumers who need that money in their pocket to pay the price at the pump? They've resisted that. They opposed it.

Our friends on the other side are also aware that even though we have passed legislation against their objection, it has gotten stalled in the other body, threatened with veto by the President, we're ready to do it again. Our motto is

try again, try again, and keep going because, bottom line, we want to address that problem. And we have actually been doing things in our 2 years on the watch despite their resistance when they had 12 years to get the job done and essentially caved into the interests of the oil companies.

So, Mr. Chairman, as a Vermonter and the sponsor of this bill, I want to object to what is really a rhetorical and political device, and that is ridiculing the importance of these two rivers to the people of my State for a partisan political argument. Energy is incredibly important and we have delivered. We've put substantive proposals on the floor. They have been debated and they have been passed. They've been stalled in the Senate or threatened with veto by the President. We're prepared to do it again. We're also prepared to reach out to the other side because we all know that in the end if we are going to be successful, we do have to work together, particularly where we have divided government. But it takes two sides, two bodies, and a President to be willing to do that, and it has not been forthcoming.

So I want to go back to a very simple fact. This legislation is about allowing Vermonters to have a study for scenic status on two rivers that are very precious to us, places where moms and dads have taken them are kids, taught them how to hunt, taught them how to fish, taught them how to be families, taught them responsibility. And there is a place for us and a time for us to do that as well as face these large issues like energy, like the war in Iraq, like redefining our foreign policy. So this is a very important piece of legislation to us, and I, as one Member of Congress, object to having it be held hostage to what is essentially a political game that's been going on far too long.

And I want to thank the chairman for the tremendous work that he's done. And, Vermonters, thank you as well.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the discussion especially about Teddy Roosevelt, a famous President. But I would remind my friend that William Howard Taft, who came after him, created more national parks, created more land in the national forests, and busted more trusts in 4 years than Roosevelt did in 8. The difference was he didn't use public relations.

Our issue is still the same. Talk about these issues after we have had a debate on real issues for a real solution on the real problem of energy that affects real Americans here on the floor. That should be our priority.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Utah for yielding, and I stand with him on these issues.

Mr. Chairman, this is a matter of setting priorities. I just got back Monday

evening for votes. I left my home State of Louisiana, my district of southwest Louisiana, that was just hit by Hurricane Gustav. Folks are suffering. Seniors are suffering back home. Seniors are suffering all over the country. Seniors in Vermont are suffering and they're going to suffer with high prices of heating oil this coming winter. Farmers, I have got farmers that lost their crops just last week, and they're faced with high diesel costs and high gasoline costs and high fertilizer costs because this country doesn't have an energy policy. What are our priorities? This is the most important bill we have done so far this week, and it's a study and it's a study based on what the subcommittee found there to be no risk involved. So I have to question what are the priorities of this Democratically led Congress.

We in Louisiana have been bearing the burden of providing energy in this country for quite a long time, and we have seen our coasts, our precious wetlands devastated, and now we are trying to rebuild those wetlands. Is that a priority? It's certainly a priority to me. But clearly getting an energy policy has to be one of the top priorities for this country. We should all recognize that. And I think my colleagues across the aisle, after spending August back home hearing from folks in their districts, would understand that.

We in Louisiana know that energy policy and environmental policy and economic policy all march together. That's good policy. We're also talking about jobs. Mr. Chairman, every time I fly home on the little stretch between Houston and Lafayette, Louisiana, I run into folks from Louisiana who are coming back or going to countries all over the globe, Equatorial Guinea, Angola, Thailand, Vietnam, countries throughout the Middle East, Louisianians with oil and gas expertise who wish they could be back in this country closer to their families. No, they're having to travel all over the globe and be away from their families for months on end to make a living in the energy industry. These are jobs that were lost to this country. These were manufacturing jobs that were lost to this country in the 1980s when a Democratically controlled Congress imposed a windfall profits tax on the oil and gas industry. And what's their answer today? Well, let's get rid of the manufacturing tax credit on oil and gas companies. Let's single out the oil and gas companies. Well, on one hand you say you want good jobs and good manufacturing jobs, but then you propose policies that drive these jobs out of this country. I don't get it. I just don't get it, and the folks back home in Louisiana don't get it.

I talked about the environment. Down in my district we've got a beautiful stretch of wetlands and marsh. It's a bird habitat for ducks, a breeding ground for ducks. White Lake, a beautiful lake, a pristine lake, is down there in Vermilion Parish. That land is

managed by BP Amoco, and they have done an outstanding job with the environment. Just yet another example of good environmental policy working hand in hand with energy policy because what does it mean? Jobs, good American jobs.

Explain that to the folks in Michigan. Explain that to the folks in Ohio who are struggling right now. If you want good American jobs, you get a good energy policy, an all-of-the-above energy policy. An energy policy that looks at oil exploration in the Outer Continental Shelf and Alaska, shale oil, nuclear energy, looks at building refining capacity, and also invests in renewables and alternatives. That's what we're advocating over here. We want to work in a bipartisan fashion.

But, no, the other side, our friends across the aisle are finding ways to avoid the issue. That's not what the American public wants today. Everybody knows what the polls are showing. Seven out of ten Americans want a comprehensive energy policy. How can you go home and explain to the seniors, an elderly woman back in your district who can't afford gasoline for her car to go to the grocery store to pick up a few essential items, so then she has to carpool with three others and now they can't afford it?

I'm all for conservation. I believe conservation is a critical part of our energy policy, but yet conservation is not enough. We need a real energy policy, an all-of-the-above approach.

Our friends across the aisle are proposing all kinds of things that we're hearing about. They're proposing a policy that permanently locks up 80 percent, 80 percent of American energy on the Outer Continental Shelf. Our friends are proposing permanently locking up 1 trillion barrels of oil from oil shale in the inner-mountain west. How can you explain that to the American public? What's your explanation? How can you say we want to permanently lock up more than 10 billion barrels of oil on Alaska's remote North Slope? And how do you explain no to nuclear power when countries like France rely on nuclear power for 80 percent of their electricity? People around this country are struggling with high utility bills.

We ought to be looking at ways to diversify our sources of energy and putting this country on a sound footing, putting America first. How can our friends across the aisle do nothing about constructing clean coal and looking at that type of new technology? This is critical. And yet again they propose additional tax increases on the energy companies that are trying to provide energy for this country. I just don't get it. I don't get it.

Mr. Chairman, I think everybody in this Chamber ought to look at that plaque up there. Look at that plaque. It quotes from Daniel Webster, who says, "Let us develop the resources of our land." The resources of our land. We shouldn't be holding back. This is



the only country holding back on this. Let us develop the resources of our land. Let us call forth its power and build its institutions. That's what this Congress should be doing. Not wasting time. I have got to go back home and explain why I spent a week up here while folks back in Louisiana are struggling after another hurricane and I have got to explain to those folks that I came up here and we didn't do anything substantively in this Congress and we didn't do anything that they care most about: getting an energy policy.

Read that plaque again: "Let us develop the resources of our land."

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I realize the political statements that are being made by my friends on the other side of the aisle. I understand them. I think relative to this bill I don't appreciate them, but I really believe that there has to be an understanding that our leadership and the Democrats on this side of the aisle can actually walk and chew gum at the same time, that we can deal with an issue that we are dealing with here today that affects the State of Vermont and deal with the very pertinent issue which is the energy policy for this country.

With that, Mr. Chairman, let me yield to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER) for such time as she may consume.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Chairman, first let me say that I support the bill in front of us, for these two rivers in Vermont. And I think that it's unfortunate that we can't seem to work on the particular bills in front of us because of the issue that the friends on the other side of the aisle keep bringing up.

What I find particularly disturbing is that for 8 years we have had two oilmen in the White House with no energy policy and my colleagues on the other side have sat silent for 2 long years, nothing since I have been here talking about it, 8 years since President Bush has come into office, and suddenly in the waning hours of this session, they are now talking about an energy policy.

I certainly welcome them to this. I think we do need an energy policy. I wish they had started talking about an energy policy 8 long years ago. What they allowed to happen in the past 8 years is for us to lose ground on an Apollo-type project to bring a real energy policy to the United States. They have allowed the oil companies to reap the greatest profits in history while they have allowed the American taxpayer to suffer while they subsidize these oil companies. That's just outrageous that they are now at this point 8 long years into it and getting near an election and they're suddenly talking about the lack of an energy policy.

□ 1430

Thank you, gentlemen, for bringing this to our attention. We have been speaking about this lack of an energy policy for a long time.

I would like to say that their idea of drill, just drill, drill, drill, and we heard it at their convention, drill, baby drill. That is a Fred Flintstone policy. Drill, baby drill, I heard a reporter say, is like people standing there at the edge of the technology revolution yelling, Electric typewriters, electric typewriters.

We are now right at the edge of this wonderful, wonderful future for our country. If you decide to join us and invest in an Apollo-type program, a program for energy independence, a program that would allow us to be independent of these nations, to have an economic base here in this country, to create jobs in a green technology, and to have renewables.

One of your own party, T. Boone Pickens, who has talked often about, and has run ads, by the way, about the fact that we can't drill our way out of this, that we only hold 2 to 3 percent of the oil and that we are consuming 25 percent. Yet I haven't heard the word "conserve" over there until just now. I heard one mention it.

We've ignored conservation, we've ignored wind, we've ignored solar, we've ignored all kinds of renewables. And when we have the drill, baby drill plan and drill baby, drill only. Well, you know what? We have simply got to face these issues. We should have faced them 8 long years ago, and we should have faced them when I got here in this 110th Congress. But I certainly welcome you to the debate now.

So why don't we do this? Why don't we first take away the subsidies from the oil company and invest in renewables? I think that would be a good start to show Americans that we hear them. Why don't we take the speculators out of the market, since we are all very concerned about the price of energy. I am particularly concerned about what is happening in New Hampshire, where the oil is so high and the winter is coming on us. I am concerned that the President of the United States put in his budget a cut in the Low Income Heating Energy Assistance Program.

So why don't we do this? Why don't we take the speculators out of the market? Why don't we say Drill now, drill, to the oil companies who had 68 million acres and they would not drill on. That would be helpful.

There's a number of things that we could have done, and I agree with you that we are at the last moments here, and it's outrageous. But we have the future of America in our hands. We have the ability, as T. Boone Pickens said, to take the wind from—he named Sweetwater, Texas to Hastings, Nebraska—we have great wind capacity, and to take solar from Sweetwater, Texas to California, and catch that. And biomass. And, yes, drilling. Drilling on land and leases that we have.

Why didn't you agree to take the leases away if the oil companies wouldn't drill? Why not? Why not do something except stand there with the same, tired drill, baby drill.

We are on the eve of this wonderful technology. We have so many people and businesses ready to invest in it. Oil companies certainly have their role. And we are dependent on oil. We are more dependent on oil than we were when George Bush came into office. That's true. But where have you been for 8 long years?

I welcome you to this discussion. But I think we should have the discussion in the appropriate place and not block every piece of legislation that is coming through right now, and let's have a comprehensive energy plan. And the first thing the other side could do to show their good faith in this would be to vote against the tax subsidies for the oil companies. If we really want to protect the American taxpayer, why don't we stop forcing them to subsidize oil companies? That would be my first question. Thank you.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. In my 6 long years of being here on this floor, and I welcome my freshman colleague from New Hampshire, we have been involved in many issues that deal with energy, and I found that what was not stopped by filibuster in the Senate, was stopped by litigation in the court, and that is part of the overall reform we are talking about, which is why we desperately need a real vote on a real solution, the American Energy Act.

May I just inquire how much time we have remaining.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ross). The gentleman from Utah has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. With that, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I want to thank my friend from Utah for giving me this opportunity to come and to speak. As I was listening to the gentlelady from New Hampshire speak, she must not have read the American Energy Act. My colleagues and I, at least about 135 of my Republican colleagues and I, have been coming back to this floor ever since August 1, when Speaker PELOSI decided to adjourn this Congress and go on a 5-week vacation rather than address the energy crisis that we have in this country.

Mr. Chairman, it's awfully strange that all of the debate, most all of the debate that I have heard on the floor today, has dealt with energy. Yet we refuse to bring an energy bill to the floor under regular order.

I think what also needs to be said, Mr. Chairman, and I hope the American people are picking up on this, is that the Democrats have been in control of this Congress for the last 20 months. The Democrats have been the majority, the controlling party in this Congress for the last 20 months. In the House, they have 236 Members, I believe. Close to it. I think the Republicans have 199. It only takes 218 to pass any legislation in this body. In fact, you can have a good idea, you can have a great idea, you can have a life-saving, wonderful, world-changing idea,

but if you don't have 218 votes, you don't have anything except an idea. If you have the worst bill in the world, or something that really hurts the American people and hurts our economy and our future and future generations, if you have 218 votes, you can pass that.

So I guess my question to the majority is that rather than continually laying the blame on the executive branch of our government, and most all Americans know that we do have three branches of government. We have got the executive branch, we have got the judicial branch, and we have got the legislative branch. The legislative branch, who the Democrats are in control of, have the responsibility for passing laws. So we can't help it. It's not our fault. If the unemployment was 4.2 percent, Mr. Chairman, when your party took the majority, and now it's 6.1, we can't help that. This comes from the legislation that you had 218 votes for to pass.

Now we can't help it because gas was \$2.06 a gallon when you took over, and that it's over \$4, or close to \$4 a gallon now. It's been as high as \$4.50. We can't help that. You were in control. You had the 218 votes to do anything you wanted to do.

But what has happened? The Democratic majority decided that rather than have a bill that would go through regular order and have subcommittee hearings and committee hearings and be brought to the floor under a rule that would be an open rule that would allow input for all 435 Members and the seven delegates from U.S. territories to be able to have amendments on the floor to speak to what their constituents had felt and what they had been told at home, they have been brought under a suspension rule.

Mr. Chairman, a suspension does not have to go through committee. It does not have a rule. There's 20 minutes of debate for each side. And then you have to have two-thirds of the vote. Well, these have been snake oil or shams or, I guess, covers to hide under, maybe, that you could go home and say that you had voted for an energy bill.

I say let's bring it under regular order. If you bring it under regular order, let's give us an opportunity to have a motion to recommit, or an alternative. But the best thing to do, the thing that I think the American people want to happen, is an open rule come to the floor, where we can all—this is a House where we are supposed to come and debate and share ideas. Let this House work its will. Let's vote on every amendment that comes to the floor. Limit it to one amendment per person.

If we have to stay here over the weekend, let's hear all the good ideas that will come out of this place. There's not just a certain number of people in this body that have good ideas, there's a lot of good ideas that come from a lot of people, and there's a lot of people here who have good ideas that never get to share them.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I encourage, I encourage the majority to bring out of mothballs that commonsense energy plan that in April of 2006 Minority Leader NANCY PELOSI said that she had. I hope that she will bring it out soon because not just my constituents in the Third District of Georgia, but constituents, people, citizens all over this country are hurting. So, hopefully, we will get to see this commonsense plan at some point in the near future.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for allotting me this time. I just want to bring us back to basics, for one thing. Whether it's the Kiwanis or the Cub Scouts or the PTA, ordinarily you talk about the issue that is at hand. And the issue that is at hand, ladies and gentlemen, and to my friends on the other side of the aisle, is we are talking about the Missisquoi and the Trout Rivers, the Wild and Scenic Rivers.

I want to thank my friend, Mr. WELCH, for bringing this matter before the House of Representatives as to trying to maintain wild and scenic streams in Vermont. That is what is being debated. That is the bill on the floor, although our friends would like to completely change the subject.

Whether it's the Kiwanis or the PTA or the boardroom or the Cub Scouts, you try to have a relevant conversation. But they decided that is not the issue. They must love this bill. They would rather talk about something else. So let's talk about the something else, which is energy.

Now my friends on the other side of the aisle, the GOP, the Republicans, in 2005 passed what they said was a landmark energy bill. I want to quote the former Speaker of the House, Dennis Hastert, on July 28, 2005:

"Americans need this (GOP energy) legislation to lower their energy costs, to drive economic growth and job creation, and to promote greater energy independence."

The minority whip, Mr. BLUNT, said on that same day:

"This (GOP energy) plan relies on simple economics. If we create a larger market for a greater amount of gasoline, we'll help drive prices down. This proposal moves the country one step closer to lowering the sky-high price of gas for consumers."

The President, a few days later, said, "I am confident that one day Americans will look back on this (GOP energy) plan as a vital step toward a more secure and more prosperous Nation that is less dependent on foreign sources of energy."

Well, ladies and gentlemen, that energy plan that was promoted by the Republicans and supported by the President back in 2005 I think now turns out to be a really bad joke on the American people. We have had our prices of oil and gas going up by almost double, sometimes during this summer

they almost tripled after that plan was implemented by a Republican Congress and a Republican President.

But that shouldn't surprise us. With two oilmen in the White House, what did you expect? This is exactly what we have gotten. Skyrocketing energy prices.

Now what we have got to do, and I can't believe that my friend from Utah, when he says that what we need to be doing is drilling here, and drilling now, really wants to drill in the middle of Salt Lake City or in any of the glorious places in Utah. This is something where it has got to be sensible energy policy. It's a comprehensive energy policy, which includes oil and gas.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. It includes oil and gas, it includes coal, it includes nuclear, it includes renewable energy, and it includes overall energy efficiency, because a barrel of oil saved is a barrel of oil earned. A Btu saved is a Btu earned.

We need a comprehensive plan. And to pull a bad joke on the American public of drilling here, drilling now, drill, baby drill, is simply a sham, and we cannot go forward with that alone. We need a comprehensive energy plan, and that is what the Democrats are going to provide.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Let me yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Ohio, Congresswoman MARCY KAPTUR.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and also rise in support of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers measure related to including Vermont's Missisquoi and Trout Rivers for further assessment.

Let me also say I think it's really sad that our GOP colleagues here are trying to divert attention from this bill and trying to change the subject to something that they have a pretty dismal record on.

□ 1445

In fact, since the Bush administration took office, our country is now importing over 1 billion more barrels of oil a year, the price of gasoline has doubled, as every American knows, and oil company profits are through the roof. Exxon alone, Exxon alone last year, made \$40.6 billion in profits, one company; BP, \$20 billion; Shell, \$31 billion in profits; Conoco, \$15.5 billion; Chevron, \$17.1 billion. That is a total, just of those companies, of \$125.3 billion.

They are loving every minute of this, friends. And the question for America is, do we want our people to be dependent on a diminishing global resource that becomes more precious every day, where blood for oil is now shed around the world? That is the real question. Are we going to grow up and live in the 21st century? It is a real choice.

One of the fellows over there on the other side of the aisle said, well, we got enough votes in the House. We sure do. We passed a couple of bills and sent them over to the Senate, where they sit unpassed. For example, our bills for extension of our renewable energy credits for solar and for wind, they are sitting over in the Senate. Do you know why? There isn't a majority of Democratic votes over there. The Senate is divided. It is 49D-49R. Our Senators are sitting on their hands over there, half of them. I would say to the gentleman who says we have got enough votes here, go get your friends over there to put their blood on the line over on the other side for the American people. They are wasting an awful lot of time.

I want to say too that the President has to sign these bills. Look what he did to the agriculture bill, one of the most important bills we have brought to this floor to try to create a new biofuels industry for this country, which rural America wanted and wants and is leading into an energy independent future for this country. What did the President of the United States do? He vetoed it. We had to override the veto here and in the other body. That is the kind of mess we have got here in Washington.

Boy, do we ever need a working majority in the Senate. And we need a bigger working majority here in the House to do what the American people sent us here to do, and that is to help our children have a better future, to have an independent energy future for this country, and not to try to say that "business as usual" is the course of the hour. Oh, no. Our people expect us to play the piano on all keys.

Where have you been for the last 8 years and where has the President of the United States been for the last 8 years?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 30 seconds.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank you very much for yielding.

Let me just say that I represent one of the solar centers of this country, one of the three top places that are inventing the future for our people. We need the help of the President of the United States. We don't need him to hold up renewable energy credits in this body or over in the Senate. Our people have seen the future, and they are building it. We don't need to have this administration produce an energy plan back in their first year that didn't even include agriculture, not even a mention of it, and renewables, and then defunded renewables for most of the years that they sat over there on Pennsylvania Avenue.

We do need new leadership. We need a working majority in the Senate. And we need a greater working majority

here and a President who will stand at the side of the American people.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I was about to be critical of the remarks of the gentlewoman from Ohio, but once she said the Senate is a problem that should be working, how can I reject that?

I would, though, remind you, if you really want to help Exxon, don't do anything. Sixty-eight percent of all the oil and 87 percent of all the natural gas is being drilled by small entrepreneurial companies. If you want competition, allow those to be successful.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOX).

Ms. FOX. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Utah for his great comments.

You know, I like Congressman PETER WELCH. We are on opposite ends of the aisle philosophically, but he is a nice guy. But I will tell you, I would like to be able to support this issue of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. However, what the American people want are lower gas prices, so they will have a chance to go and visit wild and scenic rivers. Right now, the Democrats have let the gas prices get so high, nobody can go on vacation, nobody can visit these rivers, nobody can do the kinds of things they want to do.

But the good news is during the month of August, when Republicans stayed here working while the Democrats went on vacation, we alerted the American people to the fact that we are here trying to bring down prices and that the Democrats are in charge of this Congress. It is not the President of the United States who can take action. He has already taken action. He lifted the moratorium on Outer Continental Shelf drilling.

Let me tell you, my colleague just before my colleague from Ohio was giving quotes, but let me give you a quote. Here is the best one, and the one that we are going to come back to over and over and over again. Speaker PELOSI, when she was asking for the majority in this House: "Democrats have a plan to lower gas prices. Join Democrats, who are working to lower gas prices now."

What happened? Gas prices have doubled under the Democrats. They can do their best to blame this on the Republicans. But they are in charge, and we are going to continue to inform the American people that Democrats are in charge of the Congress, that they have the ability to do something.

Republicans believe in alternatives. Certainly we want solar, wind, hydro, all the alternatives. We believe in conservation. Republicans are the original conservationists. But we cannot get to those places immediately, and we can bring down the price of gasoline by providing additional supply.

Democrats think they can ignore and maybe even repeal the basic law of economics, supply and demand. We have to have more supply. They are preventing

that. They do not want us to bring down the price of gasoline. Why, is difficult to understand.

But I say it is a simple choice for the American people this fall: Are you going to believe the people who are pro-American energy, or are you going to believe the people who are anti-American energy? The Democrats want us to remain dependent on foreign oil. They are not interested in creating additional American energy. And you can see that.

Let's talk some more about quotes. Here is another one: "This leadership team will create the most honest, most open, most ethical Congress in history." Speaker-elect NANCY PELOSI.

What have we had? Closed rules. The appropriations committees aren't even meeting, because they are scared to death that we will bring up bills that they will have to vote on that they know will pass because their Members are feeling the heat in their districts. Their constituents are hurting too.

This is not a Republican issue. It is not a Democratic issue. It is an American issue. We begged our Democratic colleagues to come and join us, vote with us, speak to the American people about this. She knows they will vote for additional American energy. There is no bill on the floor this week. Why? Because her caucus is so divided. The pro-American energy Democrats want to vote on increasing supply. They are not being allowed to do that.

Let me speak about the farm bill just a little bit. Ethanol is creating a major problem for us in this country. We are not allowing ethanol to come in here from other countries. We could get it in here cheaper than we are producing it in this country. They will not allow that. That was part of that farm bill that the President vetoed.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the chairman of our full Resources Committee, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to the distinguished subcommittee chairman, Mr. GRIJALVA, for bringing this bill forward, and the ranking member, Mr. BISHOP. Also I want to thank Mr. PETER WELCH for the tremendous leadership he has provided.

Certainly I am in support of the legislation. I recognize that much of the debate that has occurred thus far has not really been on the legislation itself, but rather has surrounded the energy issue. As all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle know, we are working toward bringing an energy bill to the floor of the House of Representatives in the very near future.

I have heard a lot of finger pointing. We all have been doing that, are guilty of that, for the last several months on this issue. Each side is trying to blame the other for the high price of gas today, ignoring the fact that the price of gas when President Bush took office was \$1.47, both houses of Congress were

in Republican hands, and the price of gas is where it is today.

But that is the past. We must look forward. Now we are all talking about using all of our domestic sources of energy in order to free ourselves from that dangerous reliance upon foreign oil. And certainly I am one of those in the category, if not 99.9 percent of my colleagues, that want to see all of our domestic sources of energy used. I dare say that in the not-too-distant future, when we do address the energy bill, if not in the next several days on the floor of this body, that we will see the most broad-ranging, most comprehensive energy bill come to this floor that we have had in several years. It will be an all-of-the-above. It will be a start toward progressive, comprehensive energy legislation.

In that, it will be a pro-drilling bill as well, although it will not be all-drilling. It will not be all my-way-or-the-highway, as some on the other side continually preach, but rather it will be a bill that will show the sacrifices that will be necessary, the compromises that are always necessary in the legislative process if we are going to address the common good of this country. So that is what we are going to see.

One important factor of that bill that we have not seen in previous energy bills is accountability and transparency. After all, these are the American people's resources, our public resources we are talking about on the OCS or with Federal leasing on on-shore Federal lands. That means the American people have the right to receive a fair dispensation for the use of their resources, as well as an accountability of royalties and fees collected thereupon.

One of the areas in which we will seek to provide much-needed reform and more oversight is in the area of royalty collection and the royalty-in-kind program specifically.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. RAHALL. Thank you. And I say we will provide that additional oversight, because the Interior Department's own Inspector General, Mr. Devaney, is today coming out with a report of his investigation of the royalty-in-kind program in which he says we have also discovered a culture of substance abuse and promiscuity in the RIK program, both within the program, including the supervisor, who engaged in illegal drug use, had sexual relations with subordinates, and is in consort with industry. Internally, several staff admitted to illegal drug use as well as elicit sexual encounters, and it goes on and on about what has been happening with this oversight program. We will strengthen this program and make the reforms necessary.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope when my chairman rolls me into the surgery room and opens me up, he will solve the problem.

May I inquire of the other side if they have additional speakers left up and how much time remains.

Mr. GRIJALVA. We have no additional speakers.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Each side has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. With that, Mr. Chairman, I will yield back my last 30 seconds.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion let me say I associate myself with the comments that our chairman, Mr. RAHALL, made about transparency and about the deeply needed reform in that agency, given the disclosure and the investigation by the Inspector General. This is a good piece of legislation. I urge its approval.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill pursuant to part 2 of House Report 110-668 shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

The text of the committee amendment is as follows:

H.R. 3667

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Missisquoi and Trout Rivers Wild and Scenic River Study Act of 2008".*

#### SEC. 2. DESIGNATION FOR STUDY.

*Section 5(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1276(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:*

*"( ) MISSISQUOI AND TROUT RIVERS, VERMONT.—The approximately 25-mile segment of the upper Missisquoi from its headwaters in Lowell to the Canadian border in North Troy; the approximately 25-mile segment from the Canadian border in East Richford to Enosburg Falls; and approximately 20 miles of the Trout River from its headwaters to its confluence with the Missisquoi River."*

#### SEC. 3. STUDY AND REPORT.

*Section 5(b) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1276(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:*

*"(19) MISSISQUOI AND TROUT RIVERS, VERMONT.—Not later than 3 years after funds are made available to carry out this paragraph, the Secretary of the Interior shall—*

*"(A) analyze the potential impact of the designation on private lands within the Missisquoi and Trout Rivers, Vermont, described in subsection (a)( ) or adjacent to that area;*

*"(B) complete the study of the Missisquoi and Trout Rivers, Vermont, described in subsection (a)( ); and*

*"(C) submit a report describing the results of that study to the appropriate committees of Congress."*

The Acting CHAIRMAN. No amendment to that amendment is in order except those printed in House Report 110-834. Each amendment shall be considered only in the order printed in the report; by a Member designated in the report; shall be considered read; shall be debatable for the time specified in the

report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment; and shall be not subject to amendment; and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

□ 1500

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 110-834.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer the amendment as the designee for Mr. RAHALL.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. GRIJALVA: Before subparagraph (A) in the quoted material adding a new paragraph (19) to section 5(b) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, insert the following and redesignate the subsequent provisions accordingly:

*"(A) analyze any potential impacts on the possession or use of a weapon, trap, or net, including a concealed weapon, on the Missisquoi and Trout Rivers, Vermont, described in subsection (a)( ) or on lands adjacent to that area;"*

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1419, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would require that the study authorized by H.R. 3667 analyze any potential impacts a wild and scenic river designation for this river might have on the possession or use of a weapon, trap or net, including a concealed weapon.

As with many of the amendments offered today, I do not believe this amendment is necessary. The underlying legislation already is more than sufficient in what it directs the Secretary to study when considering a wild and scenic river designation. Further, the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act already makes perfectly clear that these river designations are not intended to infringe upon existing State authority to manage hunting or fishing.

Nevertheless, Chairman RAHALL has filed this amendment in an overabundance of caution, and as a good-faith effort to dispel any rumors that this bill will impact existing policies on hunting and fishing. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, though not in opposition, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, we find ourselves in a unique situation on this particular amendment. The gentleman who proposed it thinks it is unnecessary. I think this is a wonderful amendment. It was great when

somebody first wrote it, and now that you have incorporated it into the general discussion on these bills, I am equally as enthralled with that amendment.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I wish to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding.

I, too, want to rise in support of the amendment of Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. BISHOP in regard to this amendment. But, Mr. Chairman, I want to state rather emphatically that I rise to express concern that this committee, the Resources Committee, which has jurisdiction over the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, has jurisdiction over the miles and miles and hundreds if not thousands of miles of Outer Continental Shelf on both coasts of this country and also the Gulf of Mexico, this committee, the Natural Resources Committee chaired by Mr. RAHALL, has jurisdiction, and yet here we are, Mr. Chairman, taking up the time of this body to delay the work that we clearly need to do in regard to a sound energy policy. And to think that we have 2 more weeks left before the majority leadership has decided that we are going to leave this place and not come back until the 111th Congress, ladies and gentlemen, that is next January. So starting from August 1 until the end of the year, that means we will have worked, what, 13 days in 5 months. That makes this congressional job, Mr. Chairman, a part-time job. If I had known that, I would go back home and deliver babies for 6 months out of the year.

We ought to be doing an energy bill right now, this week. There is no excuse for it. And there was really no excuse, Mr. Chairman, for us adjourning and going home to our districts for whatever reason for 5 weeks. We could have stayed here and in 3 days, 5 days at the most, done exactly what Mr. RAHALL just a few minutes ago on the floor of this Chamber said that you were going to do; you, the majority, were going to introduce a comprehensive bill allowing 99 percent of all United States energy resources to be utilized.

What I have seen, Mr. Chairman, of this proposal, if it looks anything like what has been suggested on the Senate side, doesn't even come close to that. This is certainly not an all-of-the-above energy bill; it is almost none of the above. And, quite honestly, the acronym for that is the NOT-A bill, none-of-the-above act. It is a NOT-A energy act.

But if the chairman is right in what he said, Mr. Chairman, that we are going to see an all-of-the-above energy bill, let's get with it. Let's get with it. There is no reason why the Committee on Energy and Commerce, with Chairman DINGELL and Ranking Member BARTON who work very well together,

very respected members on both sides of the aisle in this Chamber, we could not in a regular order go through the regular process, have an open rule, and give and take on both sides.

Put the politics aside, and let's do what we should have done 6 weeks ago to bring relief to the American people in regard to these high gasoline prices.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, just as a friendly correction for the gentleman from Georgia, nada is spelled N-A-D-A. So none of the above doesn't quite fit the acronym, so there might need to be a search for an appropriate balance.

The other thing, and he mentioned a good point. Under the jurisdiction of the Natural Resources Committee are 68 million acres under lease and not in production under the public lands of this country. So under that jurisdiction, I think the committee has made that effort to try to extend the public lands as a source for energy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I wish to defend my good friend from Georgia. Actually he said NOT-A, which is N-O-T-A. It is just that Georgian accent, it's hard to get the letters straight there. That's something we don't face in Arizona or Utah, I realize that.

Mr. Chairman, in all sincerity, we support this particular amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 110-834.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

After the new paragraph (19)(A) added to section 5(b) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent subparagraphs accordingly):

“(B) include in the study completed under this paragraph an assessment of any effect a wild and scenic designation in the study area is likely to have on energy production, transmission, or conveyance;”

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1419, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity of talking about a bill that asks us to review energy issues with this particular piece of legislation.

When the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act was originally established, it was designed specifically to inhibit, if not stop, the production of dams across rivers where electricity could be the result. It is fitting and proper to see what kind of impact this wild and scenic river would have in that area, as well as the fact that this river, the Missisquoi River, translated means the great grassy meadow. It could possibly be the “great gassy meadow” if we find some kind of minerals down there, which, once again, a review of that I think would be appropriate.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for up to 4 minutes.

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, it is great to have a chance to be on the floor to talk about energy and the lack of movement from my colleagues on the other side. It's not the first time I've been down here, it's not going to be the last, and I seriously doubt that the provision that will be brought to the floor will be an all-of-the-above, comprehensive plan.

It will be a smoke screen, it will try to have some cover for votes for November, but it will not be the all-the-above strategy that we are demanding on the floor of the House.

There will not be a provision on coal in this bill. Coal is our most valuable resource we have in this country. There will not be a provision on oil shale. More energy than any other country in oil shale. We will not deal with opening up the entire Outer Continental Shelf. We will not use the revenues to fully expand the grid or go into all the renewables.

We would like regular order. We would like the chance to move a bill through the committee. I serve on the Energy and Air Quality subcommittee; I serve on the Energy and Commerce full committee. The 2005 energy bill that you all had attacked went through regular order. It went through your committee, it went through my committee, it went through the Science Committee. It went through all the committees; it was cobbled together on the floor; we had amendments on the floor, and we voted.

Democrats attacked us for the majority of the majority rule of the floor of the House. Well, we're going to turn that around, because now it's just a majority of one: It's whatever Speaker PELOSI decides, that will be the bill on the floor. And she is dissing you all. She's not allowing you all to have any

input into the legislative process. It's whatever she says goes. And you just can't deny that fact, because it is not going through any regular order.

So when you attacked the 2005 energy bill that went through the subcommittee as being written behind closed doors, there is no more closed doors than what you are doing and proposing to do in this bill, and it is a shame and it is an insult on the legislative process.

Let's see if we address coal-to-liquid. There are two provisions you all could put in the bill right now to make us more energy independent.

You could put long-term contracting Department of Defense, who are asking for coal-to-liquid applications for jet fuel, long-term contracting, and we would have coal-to-liquid refineries being built with American jobs today.

You could take a Democrat bill, the Boucher coal-to-liquid bill. You could put RICK BOUCHER's bill in this, quote/unquote, comprehensive energy bill, and we would have coal-to-liquid refineries being built in this country within a year.

But it won't be comprehensive because you're going to not address coal, the greatest resource. We have more coal reserves than any country on this planet. So you can't really say you are going to have a comprehensive energy plan when you don't address coal.

The other thing that you will not do is open up the Outer Continental Shelf. You may open up 5 percent more. This whole red area, you have seen it numerous times, off-limits.

We're going to call your bluff. We're going to shut down this government on the CR because we're going to defeat the moratorium. So you can pass all these energy bills you want. You know you can't conference it with the Senate. You know it's not going to go to the President's desk. It's a fig leaf. It's a farce. You ought to be ashamed of yourselves.

What we're going to do is we're going to wait till the spending bill comes to fund government, and then we're going to call your bluff. Are you willing to shut the government down and keep off-limits billions of barrels of oil, trillions of cubic feet of natural gas? And if you're willing to do that, fine. We'll do that before the election. We'll go back and we'll hold you accountable at the polls.

Do you know why you can't bring a comprehensive bill that comes through regular order? Because NANCY PELOSI loses, and it's her bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I just want a point of clarification, that we didn't attack the 2005 Republican en-

ergy bill because it was done behind closed doors. I think the point on the attack is relative to the fact that it was shortsighted, Big Oil driven, and an utter failure.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Will the gentleman yield?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona controls the time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I thank the Chairman.

With regard to the Bishop amendment, we have no opposition after reviewing it, and we would accept this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP). The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1515

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 110-834.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

**SEC. 4. FUNDING.**

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed as authorizing appropriations to designate or otherwise create a new component of the national wild and scenic rivers system.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1419, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, we'll actually hear about this bill for just a minute at least before I talk about energy. But, no, I do have a serious amendment here that simply clarifies that nothing in this bill is meant to authorize appropriations for the new unit of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

The bill before us today authorizes a study to determine if the Missisquoi and Trout Rivers in Vermont are eligible to be designated wild and scenic rivers. Now, rivers designated as wild and scenic are managed by a number of Department of the Interior agencies, including the National Park Service, Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management and the Fish and Wildlife Service.

However, if you ask CRS about this, these four agencies have a combined maintenance backlog of between 14 and \$22 billion. That is between 14 and \$22 billion. And so we are going to be doing a study of another river, a study that often precedes designation. I think that is the purpose of this study, that will then put this river under the Park Service's jurisdiction or the Interior Department, and these agencies will

have to manage it. We're adding to a backlog of between 14 and \$22 billion. We shouldn't continue to do this. We can't continue to do this. We have parks in my State and everywhere else that have maintenance needs, that have staffing needs, that have needs that are going unmet, and we're going about just adding more to it, without seeking a funding source or anything else. We're simply adding more obligations to the Park Service, and we can't do that.

This amendment simply says that nothing in this authorization implies this appropriation will follow. Again, if an appropriation does follow, we are taking from the existing wild and scenic rivers or other designations that our Interior Department has to manage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition to the Flake amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Upon review of the amendment of my good friend from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), we are prepared to accept it and will not oppose the amendment.

I reserve.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for accepting the amendment, and I thank the Chair.

Now, let me say a few words about energy, since everybody else has. I didn't plan to when I came down here, but I have to say that Republicans will charge, with some justification, that the Democrats have been in charge for the last 2 years and have failed to pass significant substantial energy legislation. Democrats will charge, with some justification, that the Republicans have been in charge for a number of years and failed to do so.

We blamed the Senate. We didn't have 60 votes in the Senate. The Democrats can do the same at this point.

But here we are today, and we can't continue to look back and say we should have done something before, because we are here today and people are asking, why aren't you passing something? With justification, I might add.

Now, one of the speakers mentioned that what the Republicans were proposing was more like a Fred Flintstone bill of some type. And I would have to ask that same speaker how she plans to get home tonight. Unless she has a Flintstone mobile, she's probably riding in something that is powered by gas, maybe a hybrid, unlikely that it's electricity. In fact, less than 1 percent of our current energy needs in this country are produced by solar, which she talked about. Less than 1 percent is produced by wind.

Now, in our plan it has plans for increased solar and wind. But if you doubled, if you tripled, if you quadrupled, quintupled, do whatever you want, to solar and wind for a number of years, we are going to rely on our traditional



energy sources. And so it makes sense that, while we are searching for the next big thing, while we wait for a hydrogen economy, or while we wait for wind and solar to really come on-line, or something else that we may not even know of, we have to use the resources that we have.

So nobody on this side is really saying drill and drill only. We're saying it has to be part of the mix and it has to be all of the above.

So there's plenty of blame to go around. I myself have not voted for one energy bill since I've been here in the past 8 years because I thought that some of them were too subsidy-laden. I didn't think that they really, really allowed us, in a free market way, to go out and use our resources.

But going forward, this is what we've got to look at; what are we going to do going forward. It doesn't do anybody any good to say well, the Democrats didn't do anything, or the Republicans didn't. We're here today, and it's time to do something on this.

Again, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee and appreciate him accepting this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield back.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion to rise.

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 221, noes 193, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 580]

#### AYES—221

Ackerman	Carnahan	Doggett
Allen	Carney	Donnelly
Altmire	Carson	Doyle
Andrews	Castor	Edwards (MD)
Arcuri	Chandler	Ellison
Baca	Childers	Ellsworth
Baird	Clarke	Emanuel
Baldwin	Clay	Engel
Barrow	Cleaver	Eshoo
Bean	Clyburn	Etheridge
Becerra	Cohen	Faleomavaega
Berkley	Conyers	Farr
Berman	Cooper	Fattah
Berry	Costa	Filner
Bishop (GA)	Costello	Foster
Bishop (NY)	Courtney	Frank (MA)
Blumenauer	Cramer	Giffords
Bordallo	Crowley	Gillibrand
Boren	Cuellar	Gordon
Boswell	Cummings	Green, Al
Boucher	Davis (AL)	Green, Gene
Boyd (FL)	Davis (CA)	Grijalva
Boyd (KS)	Davis (IL)	Gutierrez
Brady (PA)	Davis, Lincoln	Hall (NY)
Braley (IA)	DeFazio	Hare
Brown, Corrine	DeGette	Harman
Butterfield	Delahunt	Hastings (FL)
Capps	DeLauro	Herseth Sandlin
Capuano	Dicks	Higgins
Cardoza	Dingell	Hill

Hinchey	McNerney	Scott (GA)
Hinojosa	McNulty	Scott (VA)
Hirono	Meek (FL)	Serrano
Holden	Meeks (NY)	Sestak
Holt	Melancon	Shea-Porter
Honda	Michaud	Sherman
Hooley	Miller (NC)	Shuler
Hoyer	Miller, George	Sires
Inslee	Mitchell	Skelton
Israel	Mollohan	Slaughter
Jackson (IL)	Moore (KS)	Smith (WA)
Jefferson	Moore (WI)	Snyder
Johnson (GA)	Murphy (CT)	Solis
Johnson, E. B.	Murphy, Patrick	Space
Kagen	Murtha	Speier
Kanjorski	Nadler	Spratt
Kaptur	Napolitano	Stupak
Kennedy	Neal (MA)	Sutton
Kildee	Oberstar	Tanner
Kilpatrick	Obey	Tauscher
Kind	Oliver	Taylor
Klein (FL)	Ortiz	Thompson (CA)
Kucinich	Pallone	Thompson (MS)
Lampson	Pascarell	Tierney
Langevin	Pastor	Towns
Larsen (WA)	Perlmutter	Tsongas
Larson (CT)	Pomerooy	Van Hollen
LaTourette	Price (NC)	Velázquez
Lewis (GA)	Rangel	Visclosky
Lipinski	Reyes	Walz (MN)
Loebach	Richardson	Wasserman
Lofgren, Zoe	Rodriguez	Schultz
Lowey	Ross	Waters
Lynch	Rothman	Watson
Mahoney (FL)	Roybal-Allard	Watt
Maloney (NY)	Ruppersberger	Waxman
Markey	Ryan (OH)	Weiner
Marshall	Salazar	Welch (VT)
Matheson	Sánchez, Linda	Wexler
Matsui	T.	Wilson (OH)
McCarthy (NY)	Sanchez, Loretta	Woolsey
McCollum (MN)	Sarbanes	Wu
McDermott	Schakowsky	Yarmuth
McGovern	Schiff	
McIntyre	Schwartz	

#### NOES—193

Abercrombie	Ehlers	Lewis (CA)
Aderholt	Emerson	Lewis (KY)
Akin	Everett	Linder
Alexander	Fallin	LoBiondo
Bachmann	Feeney	Lucas
Bachus	Ferguson	Lungrun, Daniel
Barrett (SC)	Flake	E.
Bartlett (MD)	Forbes	Mack
Barton (TX)	Fortenberry	Manzullo
Biggert	Fossella	Marchant
Bilirakis	Fox	McCarthy (CA)
Bishop (UT)	Franks (AZ)	McCaul (TX)
Blackburn	Frelinghuysen	McCotter
Blunt	Gallegly	McCrery
Boehner	Garrett (NJ)	McHenry
Bonner	Gerlach	McHugh
Bono Mack	Gilchrest	McKeon
Boozman	Gingrey	McMorris
Brady (TX)	Gohmert	Rodgers
Brown (GA)	Goode	Mica
Brown (SC)	Goodlatte	Miller (FL)
Brown-Waite,	Granger	Miller (MI)
Ginny	Graves	Miller, Gary
Buchanan	Hall (TX)	Moran (VA)
Burgess	Hastings (WA)	Murphy, Tim
Burton (IN)	Hayes	Musgrave
Buyer	Heller	Myrick
Calvert	Hensarling	Neugebauer
Camp (MI)	Herger	Nunes
Campbell (CA)	Hobson	Pearce
Cantor	Hoekstra	Pence
Capito	Hunter	Peterson (PA)
Carter	Inglis (SC)	Petri
Castle	Issa	Pickering
Chabot	Jackson-Lee	Platts
Coble	(TX)	Poe
Cole (OK)	Johnson (IL)	Porter
Conaway	Johnson, Sam	Price (GA)
Crenshaw	Jones (NC)	Pryce (OH)
Cubin	Jordan	Putnam
Culberson	Keller	Radanovich
Davis (KY)	King (IA)	Rahall
Davis, David	King (NY)	Ramstad
Davis, Tom	Kingston	Regula
Deal (GA)	Kirk	Rehberg
Dent	Kline (MN)	Reichert
Diaz-Balart, L.	Knollenberg	Renzi
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kuhl (NY)	Rogers (AL)
Doolittle	LaHood	Rogers (KY)
Drake	Lamborn	Rogers (MI)
Dreier	Latham	Rohrabacher
Duncan	Latta	Ros-Lehtinen

Roskam	Smith (NE)	Walberg
Royce	Smith (NJ)	Walden (OR)
Ryan (WI)	Smith (TX)	Walsh (NY)
Sali	Souder	Wamp
Saxton	Stark	Weller
Scalise	Stearns	Westmoreland
Schmidt	Sullivan	Whitfield (KY)
Sensenbrenner	Tancredo	Wilson (NM)
Sessions	Terry	Wilson (SC)
Shadegg	Thornberry	Wittman (VA)
Shays	Tiahrt	Wolf
Shimkus	Tiberi	Young (AK)
Shuster	Turner	Young (FL)
Simpson	Upton	

#### NOT VOTING—24

Bilbray	Gonzalez	Payne
Boustany	Hodes	Peterson (MN)
Cannon	Hulshof	Pitts
Cazayoux	Lee	Reynolds
Christensen	Levin	Rush
Edwards (TX)	Moran (KS)	Udall (CO)
English (PA)	Norton	Udall (NM)
Fortuño	Paul	Weldon (FL)

□ 1552

Messrs. WELLER of Illinois, BRADY of Texas and BURTON of Indiana changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Messrs. WEINER, SNYDER, COOPER, KLEIN of Florida, CHANDLER, LYNCH, Ms. KILPATRICK, Messrs. FARR, McDERMOTT, ENGEL, ETHERIDGE, BOYD of Florida, ACKERMAN, HINOJOSA, BLUMENAUER, WELCH of Vermont, BISHOP of Georgia, COSTELLO, and LAMPSON changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CAPUANO) having assumed the chair, Mr. ROSS, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3667) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of the Missisquoi and Trout Rivers in the State of Vermont for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1727

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALTMIRE) at 5 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.

#### MISSISQUOI AND TROUT RIVERS WILD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1419 and rule



XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3667.

□ 1728

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3667) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of the Missisquoi and Trout Rivers in the State of Vermont for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, with Mr. DOYLE (Acting Chairman) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. POMEROY). When the committee of the whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 3 printed in House report 110-834, offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), had been disposed of.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 418, noes 0, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 581]

AYES—418

Ackerman	Boyd (FL)	Conaway
Aderholt	Boyda (KS)	Conyers
Akin	Brady (PA)	Cooper
Alexander	Brady (TX)	Costa
Allen	Braley (IA)	Costello
Altmire	Broun (GA)	Courtney
Andrews	Brown (SC)	Cramer
Arcuri	Brown, Corrine	Crenshaw
Bachmann	Brown-Waite,	Crowley
Bachus	Ginny	Cubin
Baird	Buchanan	Cuellar
Baldwin	Burgess	Cummings
Barrett (SC)	Burton (IN)	Davis (AL)
Barrow	Butterfield	Davis (CA)
Bartlett (MD)	Buyer	Davis (IL)
Barton (TX)	Calvert	Davis (KY)
Bean	Camp (MI)	Davis, David
Becerra	Campbell (CA)	Davis, Lincoln
Berkley	Cannon	Davis, Tom
Berman	Cantor	Deal (GA)
Berry	Capito	DeFazio
Biggert	Capps	DeGette
Blibray	Capuano	Delahunt
Bilirakis	Carnahan	DeLauro
Bishop (GA)	Carney	Dent
Bishop (NY)	Carson	Diaz-Balart, L.
Bishop (UT)	Carter	Diaz-Balart, M.
Blackburn	Castle	Dicks
Blumenauer	Castor	Dingell
Blunt	Chabot	Doggett
Boehner	Chandler	Donnelly
Bonner	Childers	Doolittle
Bono Mack	Clarke	Doyle
Boozman	Clay	Drake
Bordallo	Cleaver	Dreier
Boren	Clyburn	Duncan
Boswell	Coble	Edwards (MD)
Boucher	Cohen	Edwards (TX)
Boustany	Cole (OK)	Ehlers

Ellison	Larson (CT)	Reynolds	Wilson (NM)	Wolf	Young (AK)
Ellsworth	Latham	Richardson	Wilson (OH)	Woolsey	Young (FL)
Emanuel	LaTourette	Rodriguez	Wilson (SC)	Wu	
Emerson	Latta	Rogers (AL)	Wittman (VA)	Yarmuth	
Engel	Lewis (CA)	Rogers (KY)			
English (PA)	Lewis (GA)	Rogers (MI)			
Eshoo	Lewis (KY)	Rohrabacher			
Etheridge	Linder	Ros-Lehtinen			
Everett	Lipinski	Roskam			
Faleomavaega	LoBiondo	Ross			
Fallin	Loebisack	Rothman			
Farr	Lofgren, Zoe	Roybal-Allard			
Fattah	Lowey	Royce			
Ferguson	Lucas	Ruppersberger			
Filner	Lungren, Daniel	Rush			
Flake	E. Lynch	Ryan (OH)			
Forbes	Mack	Ryan (WI)			
Fortenberry	Mahoney (FL)	Salazar			
Fossella	Maloney (NY)	Sali			
Foster	Manzullo	Sanchez, Linda			
Fox	Marchant	T. Sanchez, Loretta			
Frank (MA)	Markey	Sarbanes			
Franks (AZ)	Marshall	Saxton			
Frelinghuysen	Matheson	Scalise			
Gallely	Matsui	Schakowsky			
Garrett (NJ)	McCarthy (CA)	Schiff			
Gerlach	McCarthy (NY)	Schmidt			
Giffords	McCaul (TX)	Schwartz			
Gilchrest	McCollum (MN)	Scott (GA)			
Gillibrand	McCotter	Scott (VA)			
Gingrey	McCrery	Sensenbrenner			
Gohmert	McDermott	Serrano			
Gonzalez	McGovern	Sessions			
Goode	McHenry	Sestak			
Goodlatte	McHugh	Shadegg			
Gordon	McIntyre	Shays			
Granger	McKeon	Shea-Porter			
Graves	McMorris	Sherman			
Green, Al	Rodgers	Shimkus			
Green, Gene	McNerney	Shuler			
Grijalva	McNulty	Shuster			
Gutierrez	Meek (FL)	Simpson			
Hall (NY)	Meeks (NY)	Sires			
Hall (TX)	Melancon	Skelton			
Hare	Mica	Slaughter			
Hastings (FL)	Michaud	Smith (NE)			
Hastings (WA)	Miller (FL)	Smith (NJ)			
Hayes	Miller (MI)	Smith (TX)			
Heller	Miller (NC)	Smith (WA)			
Hensarling	Miller, Gary	Snyder			
Herger	Miller, George	Solis			
Herseeth Sandlin	Mitchell	Souder			
Higgins	Mollohan	Space			
Hill	Moore (KS)	Speier			
Hinche	Moore (WI)	Spratt			
Hirono	Moran (KS)	Stark			
Hobson	Moran (VA)	Stearns			
Hoekstra	Murphy (CT)	Stupak			
Holden	Murphy, Patrick	Sullivan			
Holt	Murphy, Tim	Sutton			
Honda	Murtha	Tancredo			
Hoolley	Musgrave	Tanner			
Hoyer	Myrick	Tauscher			
Hunter	Nadler	Taylor			
Inglis (SC)	Napolitano	Terry			
Inslee	Neal (MA)	Thompson (CA)			
Israel	Neugebauer	Thompson (MS)			
Issa	Norton	Thornberry			
Jackson (IL)	Nunes	Tiahrt			
Jackson-Lee	Oberstar	Tiberi			
(TX)	Obey	Tierney			
Jefferson	Pallone	Towns			
Johnson (GA)	Pascrell	Tsongas			
Johnson (IL)	Pastor	Turner			
Johnson, E. B.	Paul	Udall (CO)			
Johnson, Sam	Payne	Udall (NM)			
Jones (NC)	Pearce	Upton			
Jordan	Pence	Van Hollen			
Kagen	Perlmutter	Velázquez			
Kanjorski	Petri	Visclosky			
Kaptur	Pickering	Walberg			
Kennedy	Platts	Walden (OR)			
Kildee	Poe	Walsh (NY)			
Kilpatrick	Pomeroy	Walz (MN)			
Kind	Porter	Wamp			
King (IA)	Price (GA)	Wasserman			
King (NY)	Price (NC)	Schultz			
Kingston	Pryce (OH)	Waters			
Kirk	Putnam	Watson			
Klein (FL)	Radanovich	Watt			
Kline (MN)	Rahall	Waxman			
Knollenberg	Ramstad	Weiner			
Kucinich	Rangel	Welch (VT)			
Kuhl (NY)	Regula	Weldon (FL)			
LaHood	Rehberg	Weller			
Lamborn	Reichert	Westmoreland			
Lampson	Renzi	Wexler			
Langevin	Reyes	Whitfield (KY)			
Larsen (WA)					

#### NOT VOTING—20

Abercrombie	Fortuño	Levin
Baca	Harman	Olver
Cardoza	Hinojosa	Ortiz
Cazayoux	Hodes	Peterson (MN)
Christensen	Hulshof	Peterson (PA)
Culberson	Keller	Pitts
Feeney	Lee	

□ 1753

Mr. MACK changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER) having assumed the chair, Mr. POMEROY, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3667) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of the Missisquoi and Trout Rivers in the State of Vermont for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, pursuant to House Resolution 1419, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. SALI. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SALI. Yes, in its current form.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Sali of Idaho moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3667 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end add a new title designated and entitled “**Title II—American Energy Act**”, comprised of the text of H.R. 6566, 110th Congress, as introduced in the House of Representatives (and conform the title designation, section numbers, and any references to such sections, accordingly).

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A point of order is reserved.

The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SALI. Madam Speaker, today, millions of Americans will go to work, and the overwhelming majority of them will drive. No matter what type of car they use, tens of millions of Americans will use privately owned passenger automobiles to get to and from work and school, the stores where they shop, and the soccer fields where their kids practice. That's reality. That's here and now.

We have to think about how to help the people that we represent today, the great majority of our fellow citizens for whom the past few months have been an energy nightmare.

We are here today because my colleagues and I on this side of the aisle believe in what our distinguished leader has called the All-of-the-Above Energy Agenda. Many of us, including me, came here during the August recess to call on our friends in the majority to come back and work with us on an energy policy that would enable us to access America's incredible natural resources in an environmentally responsible way quickly and effectively.

That's why I'm offering this motion to recommit so that the House may vote on the American Energy Act now. Madam Speaker, this is a question of stewardship. We all look forward to a future where fossil fuels are less prevalent. We're all working toward that future. We need to pursue solar and wind power, advance hydrogen fuel cell technology, and encourage nuclear energy so we can cut through the red tape and construct plants as soon as possible.

All of these are components of the American Energy Act, and I rise to call for a vote on that act today. But the American Energy Act also calls for drilling right now.

□ 1800

We need to drill—drill offshore, drill in ANWR, drill in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, drill in the new fields of North Dakota—aggressively develop oil sands and oil shale; we need to drill wherever there is a realistic promise of obtaining fuel for America's families.

Let me give you some examples of why. According to an assessment conducted by the Minerals Management Service of technically recoverable oil and natural gas, the OCS contains 86 billion barrels of oil and 420 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. Both could be obtained safely and in an environmentally sound way.

In addition, there are an estimated 18 billion barrels of oil and 76 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, or approximately 20 percent of the undiscovered technically recoverable resources in the OCS that are completely off-limits today, but the extreme lobby that seems to have a grip on the majority's

energy policies won't allow us to go get it, and people suffer as a result.

My motion to recommit promotes and offers effective incentives for energy conservation and more efficient use of our energy resources. It promotes all manner of alternative energy sources, and even establishes a renewable energy trust fund using revenues generated by exploration in the deep ocean and on the Arctic coastal plain.

We fuel our cars and trucks and heat our homes and businesses because hardworking men and women take risks, drill for oil, refine it, store it, ship it and then sell it to individual customers. We need more of it—a lot more—now.

We are all mindful that drilling won't make our energy problems disappear, but it will start us in the right direction. In the next few years, the oil that new drilling provides would start flowing into our fuel pumps. And in the interim, the fact that America is finally shattering our long-term dependence on foreign oil will send an unmistakable signal to friend and foe alike that America will use more of her own resources and thereby regain a degree of economic independence that we have lost for far too long.

We have heard talk that there will be another new comprehensive energy bill from the Democrats. We also just took a break for more than an hour because there is not agreement across the aisle on what that bill will look like. Apparently, there are real questions whether the Democrat Members even support the proposal of Speaker PELOSI of a day ago. But I submit that now is the time to stop politicking, to do the right thing and vote on this motion to recommit right now. Everything the American public is asking us to do is included in this motion. America wants this all-of-the-above kind of legislation.

Now a point of order has been reserved. That means that those across the aisle will try to beat this motion on a technicality. If we ask Americans, do you care more for an amendment to this river study bill that is totally free of technicalities or for Congress to finally vote to conserve, produce alternative energy and drill here and drill now, we all know they wouldn't care one whit about technicalities. They want energy.

Earlier, Chairman RAHALL said Republicans and Democrats have been too busy trying to blame each other for high gas prices. Well, I say America is blaming all of Congress for high gas and diesel prices. And I submit on my side of the aisle, by offering this amendment—that America wants—we're doing our part to make things right with the American people.

I invite my colleagues across the aisle, don't sidestep this opportunity to do the right thing because of a technicality. Do the right thing. Vote for this motion to recommit so we can finally get the job done that the American public is demanding.

#### POINT OF ORDER

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I make a point of order that the motion to recommit contains nongermane instructions in violation of clause 7 of rule XVI.

Let me add, Madam Speaker, the Office of the Inspector General just released an investigation that they conducted on the office responsible for protecting the taxpayers in the royalty collections on our public lands. Let me just give a couple of quotes from the summary of the report.

"A culture of ethical failure. The single most serious problem our investigations revealed is a pervasive culture of exclusivity, exempt from the rules that govern all other employees of the Federal Government. In other cases, the results of our investigation revealed a program taxed with implementing a business model program, such as royalty-in-kind marketers, donned a private sector approach to essentially everything they did. This included effectively opting themselves out of the Ethics in Government Act, both in practice, and at one point even explored doing so by policy or regulation. We also discovered a culture of substance abuse and promiscuity in the RIK program, both within the program, including supervisors who engaged in illegal drug use and had sexual relations and consort with industry in the oil business."

I mention those because the gravity of this particular problem, this pathological behavior, should be noted and looked into by this Congress. When we get our new energy policy on the floor—soon—I hope that the other side will join with me in ensuring that ethical reform of the agency responsible for the protection of the taxpayers' investment are part and parcel of any comprehensive energy reform.

With that, I insist on the point of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

If not, the Chair is prepared to rule.

The gentleman from Arizona makes a point of order that the instructions in the motion to recommit are not germane. The bill, H.R. 3667, as amended, is confined to the study of two rivers under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and closely related issues.

The instructions in the motion to recommit address H.R. 6566, a bill containing subjects unrelated to the pending bill and containing provisions outside the jurisdiction of the Committee on Natural Resources. As such, the Chair finds that the motion to recommit is not germane. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. SALI. Madam Speaker, I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the House?

MOTION TO TABLE OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I move to table the appeal of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to table.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SALI. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to table will be followed by 5-minute votes on the passage of the bill, if arising without further proceedings in recommitment, and the motion to suspend the rules with regard to H.R. 4081.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 228, nays 187, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 582]

YEAS—228

Abercrombie	Giffords	Moore (WI)
Ackerman	Gilchrest	Moran (VA)
Allen	Gillibrand	Murphy (CT)
Altmire	Gonzalez	Murphy, Patrick
Andrews	Gordon	Murtha
Arcuri	Green, Al	Nadler
Baird	Green, Gene	Napolitano
Baldwin	Grijalva	Oberstar
Barrow	Gutierrez	Obey
Bean	Hall (NY)	Olver
Becerra	Hare	Pallone
Berkley	Hastings (FL)	Pascarella
Berman	Heller	Pastor
Berry	Hereth Sandlin	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Higgins	Perlmutter
Bishop (NY)	Hill	Pomeroy
Blumenauer	Hinchey	Porter
Boren	Hirono	Price (NC)
Boswell	Holden	Rahall
Boucher	Holt	Ramstad
Boyd (FL)	Honda	Rangel
Boyd (KS)	Hooley	Reichert
Brady (PA)	Hoyer	Reyes
Braley (IA)	Inlee	Richardson
Brown, Corrine	Israel	Rodriguez
Butterfield	Jackson (IL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Capps	Jackson-Lee	Ross
Capuano	(TX)	Rothman
Carnahan	Jefferson	Roybal-Allard
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Ruppersberger
Carson	Johnson, E. B.	Rush
Castor	Kagen	Ryan (OH)
Chandler	Kanjorski	Salazar
Clarke	Kaptur	Sánchez, Linda
Clay	Kennedy	T.
Cleaver	Kildee	Sanchez, Loretta
Clyburn	Kilpatrick	Sarbanes
Cohen	Kind	Schakowsky
Conyers	Klein (FL)	Schiff
Cooper	Kucinich	Schwartz
Costa	LaHood	Scott (GA)
Costello	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Courtney	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Cramer	Larson (CT)	Sestak
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Shays
Cuellar	Lipinski	Shea-Porter
Cummings	Loebach	Sherman
Davis (CA)	Lofgren, Zoe	Shuler
Davis (IL)	Lowey	Sires
Davis, Lincoln	Lynch	Skelton
DeFazio	Mahoney (FL)	Slaughter
DeGette	Maloney (NY)	Smith (WA)
Delahunt	Markey	Snyder
DeLauro	Marshall	Solis
Dicks	Matheson	Space
Dingell	Matsui	Speier
Doggett	McCarthy (NY)	Spratt
Donnelly	McCollum (MN)	Stark
Doyle	McDermott	Stupak
Edwards (MD)	McGovern	Sutton
Edwards (TX)	McIntyre	Tanner
Ellison	McNerney	Tauscher
Ellsworth	McNulty	Taylor
Emanuel	Meek (FL)	Thompson (CA)
Engel	Meeks (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Eshoo	Melancon	Tierney
Etheridge	Michaud	Towns
Farr	Miller (NC)	Tsongas
Fattah	Miller, George	Udall (CO)
Filner	Mitchell	Udall (NM)
Foster	Mollohan	Van Hollen
Frank (MA)	Moore (KS)	Velázquez

Visclosky  
Walz (MN)  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters

Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch (VT)

Wexler  
Wilson (OH)  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Yarmuth

NAYS—187

Aderholt	Fox	Myrick
Akin	Franks (AZ)	Neugebauer
Alexander	Frelinghuysen	Nunes
Bachmann	Gallely	Paul
Bachus	Garrett (NJ)	Pence
Barrett (SC)	Gerlach	Peterson (PA)
Bartlett (MD)	Gingrey	Petri
Barton (TX)	Gohmert	Pickering
Biggart	Goode	Platts
Bilbray	Goodlatte	Poe
Bilirakis	Granger	Price (GA)
Bishop (UT)	Graves	Pryce (OH)
Blackburn	Hall (TX)	Putnam
Blunt	Hastings (WA)	Radanovich
Boehner	Hayes	Regula
Bonner	Hensarling	Rehberg
Bono Mack	Herger	Renzi
Boozman	Hobson	Reynolds
Boustany	Hoekstra	Rogers (AL)
Brady (TX)	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Broun (GA)	Inglis (SC)	Rogers (MI)
Brown (SC)	Issa	Rohrabacher
Brown-Waite,	Johnson (IL)	Roskam
Ginny	Johnson, Sam	Royce
Buchanan	Jones (NC)	Ryan (WI)
Burgess	Jordan	Sali
Burton (IN)	Keller	Saxton
Buyer	King (IA)	Scalise
Calvert	King (NY)	Schmidt
Camp (MI)	Kingston	Sensenbrenner
Campbell (CA)	Kirk	Sessions
Cannon	Kline (MN)	Shadegg
Cantor	Knollenberg	Shimkus
Capito	Kuhl (NY)	Shuster
Carter	Lamborn	Simpson
Castle	Lampson	Smith (NE)
Chabot	Latham	Smith (NJ)
Childers	LaTourette	Smith (TX)
Coble	Latta	Souder
Cole (OK)	Lewis (CA)	Stearns
Conaway	Lewis (KY)	Sullivan
Crenshaw	Linder	Tancredo
Cubin	LoBiondo	Terry
Culberson	Lucas	Thornberry
Davis (KY)	Lungren, Daniel	Tiahrt
Davis, David	E.	Tiberi
Davis, Tom	Mack	Turner
Deal (GA)	Manzullo	Upton
Dent	Marchant	Walberg
Diaz-Balart, L.	McCarthy (CA)	Walden (OR)
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCauley (TX)	Walsh (NY)
Doolittle	McCotter	Wamp
Drake	McHenry	Weldon (FL)
Dreier	McHugh	Weller
Duncan	McKeon	Westmoreland
Ehlers	McMorris	Whitfield (KY)
Emerson	Rodgers	Wilson (NM)
English (PA)	Mica	Wilson (SC)
Everett	Miller (FL)	Wittman (VA)
Fallin	Miller (MI)	Wolf
Ferguson	Miller, Gary	Young (AK)
Flake	Moran (KS)	Young (FL)
Forbes	Murphy, Tim	
Fortenberry	Musgrave	

NOT VOTING—18

Baca	Harman	McCrery
Cardoza	Hinojosa	Neal (MA)
Cazayoux	Hodes	Ortiz
Davis (AL)	Hulshof	Pearce
Feeney	Lee	Peterson (MN)
Fossella	Levin	Pitts

□ 1825

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS changed her vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. BOEHNER. I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Boehner moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3667 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House promptly in the form to which perfected at the time of this motion, with the following amendment:

After the new paragraph (19)(A) added to section 5(b) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent subparagraphs accordingly):

“(B) include in the study completed under this paragraph an assessment of any effect a wild and scenic designation in the study area is likely to have on jobs, including agricultural employment;”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Speaker and my colleagues, on behalf of all my Republican colleagues, I want to welcome my Democrat colleagues back to the House.

Five weeks ago, after the protest of the minority, you adjourned the House without a vote on the American Energy Act, H.R. 6566. You and your fellow Democrats left town for five weeks, but Republicans refused to leave. And we were here each and every day during the August recess talking to thousands of Americans that were coming through the Capitol, and we stood here every day asking for a vote on our bill that does all of the above, the American Energy Act; a bill that the American people want us to vote on. And that's all we're asking for is a vote.

And today, instead of allowing a vote on our all-of-the-above plan, there are rumors that there is going to be a bill coming to the floor quickly that no one has ever seen, that does some of the above, maybe a little of the above, but clearly not what the American people want, which is “all of the above,” some bill that's being written in the back room in the dark of night that no one has yet seen.

Now, listen, the American people don't want a sham. They don't want a hoax. They have suffered all summer long in the face of high gas prices and high energy prices, and they are demanding a vote here in this Congress on a plan that does all of the above, not some of the bill, not a little bit of the above, but all of the above.

Madam Speaker, you promised that this would be the most open and accountable Congress in history. And in that light, I respectfully ask you now give the American people a vote on the American Energy Act, H.R. 6566. Will it be on the floor this week? Will you commit to giving the American people a straight up-or-down vote on a plan they want, the all-of-the-above plan, the American Energy Act?

Madam Speaker, this is the U.S. House of Representatives. As all of my colleagues have known, we all refer to this as the people's House because none of us got here without being elected by all of the people in our districts. Why

not let the House work its will? Why not allow the Congress to decide the future of our energy security here in America? And I don't think the American people are going to rest until Congress takes action on energy that does all of the above.

So, Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend my motion to recommend to include the text of H.R. 6566, the American Energy Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. GRIJALVA. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Speaker, this is a sham. I withdraw my motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the motion is withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on passage will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules with regard to H.R. 4081.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 299, noes 118, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 583]

AYES—299

Abercrombie	Castle	Etheridge
Ackerman	Castor	Farr
Alexander	Chandler	Fattah
Allen	Childers	Ferguson
Altmire	Clarke	Filner
Andrews	Clay	Fortenberry
Arcuri	Cleaver	Fossella
Baird	Clyburn	Foster
Baldwin	Cohen	Frank (MA)
Barrett (SC)	Conyers	Frelinghuysen
Barrow	Cooper	Galleghy
Bartlett (MD)	Costa	Garrett (NJ)
Bean	Costello	Gerlach
Becerra	Courtney	Giffords
Berkley	Cramer	Gilchrest
Berry	Crowley	Gillibrand
Biggett	Cuellar	Gonzalez
Bilirakis	Cummings	Gordon
Bishop (GA)	Davis (AL)	Green, Al
Bishop (NY)	Davis (CA)	Green, Gene
Bishop (UT)	Davis (IL)	Grijalva
Blumenauer	Davis, Lincoln	Gutierrez
Bonner	Davis, Tom	Hall (NY)
Bono Mack	DeFazio	Hare
Boren	DeGette	Hastings (FL)
Boswell	Delahunt	Hayes
Boucher	DeLauro	Herseth Sandlin
Boyd (FL)	Dent	Higgins
Boyd (KS)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Hill
Brady (PA)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hinchev
Braley (IA)	Dicks	Hirono
Brown, Corrine	Dingell	Holden
Brown-Waite,	Doggett	Holt
Ginny	Donnelly	Honda
Buchanan	Doyle	Hooley
Butterfield	Edwards (MD)	Hoyer
Camp (MI)	Edwards (TX)	Inglis (SC)
Cannon	Ehlers	Inslee
Capito	Ellison	Israel
Capps	Ellsworth	Jackson (IL)
Capuano	Emanuel	Jackson-Lee
Carahan	Engel	(TX)
Carney	English (PA)	Jefferson
Carson	Eshoo	Johnson (GA)

Johnson (IL)	Mitchell
Johnson, E. B.	Mollohan
Jones (NC)	Moore (KS)
Kagen	Moore (WI)
Kanjorski	Moran (VA)
Kaptur	Murphy (CT)
Kennedy	Murphy, Patrick
Kildee	Murphy, Tim
Kilpatrick	Murtha
Kind	Nadler
King (NY)	Napolitano
Kirk	Neal (MA)
Klein (FL)	Oberstar
Knollenberg	Obey
Kucinich	Oliver
Kuhl (NY)	Pallone
LaHood	Pascarell
Lampson	Pastor
Langevin	Payne
Larsen (WA)	Perlmutter
Larson (CT)	Peterson (PA)
LaTourette	Petri
Lewis (CA)	Platts
Lewis (GA)	Pomeroy
Lipinski	Porter
LoBiondo	Price (NC)
Loebuck	Pryce (OH)
Lofgren, Zoe	Rahall
Lowe	Ramstad
Lynch	Rangel
Mahoney (FL)	Rehberg
Maloney (NY)	Reichert
Manzullo	Renzi
Markey	Reyes
Marshall	Richardson
Matheson	Rodriguez
Matsui	Rogers (AL)
McCarthy (NY)	Rogers (MI)
McCaul (TX)	Ros-Lehtinen
McCullum (MN)	Ross
McCotter	Rothman
McDermott	Roybal-Allard
McGovern	Ruppersberger
McHenry	Rush
McHugh	Ryan (OH)
McIntyre	Salazar
McKeon	Sánchez, Linda
McNerney	T.
McNulty	Sanchez, Loretta
Meek (FL)	Sarbanes
Meeks (NY)	Saxton
Melancon	Schakowsky
Michaud	Schiff
Miller (MI)	Schmidt
Miller (NC)	Schwartz
Miller, Gary	Scott (GA)
Miller, George	Scott (VA)

NOES—118

Aderholt	Fox	Myrick
Akin	Franks (AZ)	Neugebauer
Bachmann	Gingrey	Nunes
Bachus	Gohmert	Paul
Barton (TX)	Goode	Pearce
Bilbray	Goodlatte	Pence
Blackburn	Granger	Pickering
Blunt	Graves	Poe
Boehner	Hall (TX)	Price (GA)
Boozman	Hastings (WA)	Putnam
Boustany	Heller	Radanovich
Brady (TX)	Hensarling	Regula
Broun (GA)	Herger	Reynolds
Brown (SC)	Hobson	Rogers (KY)
Burgess	Hoekstra	Rohrabacher
Burton (IN)	Hunter	Roskam
Buyer	Issa	Royce
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Ryan (WI)
Campbell (CA)	Jordan	Sali
Cantor	Keller	Scalise
Carter	King (IA)	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Kingston	Sessions
Coble	Kline (MN)	Shadegg
Cole (OK)	Lamborn	Shuster
Conaway	Latham	Simpson
Crenshaw	Latta	Smith (NE)
Cubin	Lewis (KY)	Souder
Culberson	Linder	Stearns
Davis (KY)	Lucas	Sullivan
Davis, David	Lungren, Daniel	Tancred
Deal (GA)	E.	Thornberry
Doolittle	Mack	Tiahrt
Drake	Marchant	Walberg
Dreier	McCarthy (CA)	Wamp
Duncan	McMorris	Weldon (FL)
Emerson	Rodgers	Westmoreland
Everett	Mica	Wilson (NM)
Fallin	Miller (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Flake	Moran (KS)	Wittman (VA)
Forbes	Musgrave	Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—16

Baca	Hinojosa	Ortiz
Berman	Hodes	Peterson (MN)
Cardoza	Hulshof	Pitts
Cazayoux	Lee	Velázquez
Feeney	Levin	
Harman	McCrery	

□ 1849

Messrs. FORBES and WITTMAN of Virginia changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 6532. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore the Highway Trust Fund balance.

#### QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise on a question of personal privilege under rule IX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has been made aware of a valid basis for the gentleman's point of personal privilege.

The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RANGEL. Not to worry, my friend and colleagues. I have no intentions of keeping you for 1 hour, especially at this time of the day. But a couple of weeks ago the leadership of the minority had asked that I be thrown out of the House and censured based on a newspaper story, and I just want to thank those people who were thoughtful enough to think that even Members of Congress at some times should not rely on newspaper stories, but rather the Ethics Committee, which is bipartisan. More recently, however, my dear friend JOHN BOEHNER has asked the Speaker to ask me to step aside as the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Now I say “my dear friend John Boehner,” not as this word is tossed around in the House and Senate casually. I say it because JOHN BOEHNER has, for many, many years, been my friend. We have worked so closely together in bipartisan areas that just a couple of weeks ago he allowed me to strengthen my relationship with JIM MCCRERY on the Ways and Means Committee to get unemployment compensation passed, and lauded our efforts, as I lauded his.

I look around and I see GEORGE MILLER, who more than once said what a straight shooter he has been on Education. STENY HOYER has reminded me

that, you know, he may disagree with JOHN BOEHNER, but one thing is clear, that when you speak to him, that he says what he means and he means what he says.

Well, I don't really think he means that I am incompetent and should step down. I don't think he really means or thinks that the Speaker is going to remove me from the House of Representatives. I don't think that he thinks I am a threat to this honorable House, which I am so proud to be a Member of. And for those people who say hey, let the Ethics Committee make the decision, I thank you for myself, for my name, for my friends and for my supporters.

But believe it or not, I want to do this for the House of Representatives. I don't want any Member, Republican or Democrat, that is less politically secure than me to go through what I have had to go through for the last several weeks, because for them they never could survive. They would lose the election. And it won't be of anything that the voters knew. It would be what this Congress has done to each other.

You know, the Ways and Means Committee, we made a special effort to be civil, even when we disagreed. We are so proud, with the support of Speaker PELOSI, of STENY HOYER, and, yes, JOHN BOEHNER, working with us and trying to see what we can get done.

At the end of this election, this Congress is going to have serious things to take care of. And we won't have Democratic solutions to taxes and health and Social Security and the variety of things with peace and war. We are going to have to resolve these issues as a United States Congress in a bipartisan way. There is not going to be any Democratic way to do it.

And we are going to have to work together, not because we like each other, but we have a special responsibility to the people of the United States to make certain that our reputations may be low in terms of production, but if someone doesn't get health care, doesn't get that Social Security check, or for any reason finds himself without a house, they are not going to say the Democrats did it or the Republicans did it. They are going to say that this Congress let them down. It is going to be difficult, no matter who is the President or who is in the leadership.

But it does not help to polarize this body and take wild shots at each other, whether they are chairmen or whether they are freshmen, knowing that at the end of the day you are not going to accomplish anything substantive, but you are going to make it more difficult for us to get a law.

Do I say that JOHN BOEHNER knows this? I tell you this: To show you the depth of my friendship, I am embarrassed that he feels he has to do this. There is no way in the world, based on his knowledge of my love for this House, that he would believe that I would do anything to dishonor it. And

there is no question in my mind that at the end of the day, when the dust settles, that this issue is going to be moot. But I just don't know what the relationship between people is going to be. So I don't know the next move, but I would suggest that this is not the way to go.

JOHN BOEHNER, JOHN BOEHNER, JOHN BOEHNER. On the Tim Russert show, what they did to my friend there in saying that he was passing out illegal checks on the floor. A mistake? We all make them, and we all have to say we are sorry. But we all don't have to attack each other, because at the end of the day, that is all we may have to do to each other and get nothing done.

I am suggesting to you this: Mistakes may have been made by me, and I briefly want to let you know the issues that are before the Ethics Committee as relates to three subjects. And I will be brief.

Some 20 years ago, I was in the Dominican Republic. I got a call from a long and dear friend of mine to visit this place called Punta Cana, Dominican Republic, where he had some dream of making this a resort. I didn't want to go. My wife said friendship dictated it.

I got there and he was telling me about the dream. And I was impressed with his dream, but I said, what the heck has that got to do with me?

Well, he says, they want to start, they want to build some beach houses here, and there is the sand and there is the beach, and I think it's a good deal.

I said, it may be a good deal for you, but I really don't need a beach house and I can't afford it. And, besides, there is no house here.

He says, no, we haven't built them yet.

So I said, look, Ted, I don't have the time.

By the time they showed me the renderings, and they told me that it would cost \$82,000, I said I wish I had the \$82,000. Good-bye.

He says, no, if you have got \$28,000, then all they have to do is take the rentals from it and reduce the mortgages, and you can only use it for 9 months, but ultimately it would be yours.

I said, we can talk.

I refinanced my house. We had no savings, no nothing, and, quite frankly, I relied on the reputation, as I did then and will now, of a guy whose reputation is untouched.

Gradually the mortgage was coming down. I had received no financial statement. I could not break the culture in terms of Dominican and Spanish. I received no money, no check. Never did. But let's face it, I should have known. And after this hit the fan, I had my lawyer to go. He broke the balance and found out the fact that they didn't give out statements. Some years there was no statement. There was a half a dozen statements that we have accumulated. And then we took the balance, added to the mortgage of about \$50,000, another \$20,000 for another room.

All of the reports would indicate that RANGEL had a cash cow. RANGEL got some money. No. What happened was anybody who had a villa, whatever money they got, the hotel first would take their cut. Then they would take out taxes, they would take out renovations, they would take out hurricane expenses, they would take out interest, they would take out everything. At the end of the thing, whether your place was used or not used, they would equally distribute the money. Some years it was \$5,000. Some years it was nothing.

How many times did I use it in the nine weeks? I wish I had used it for nine weeks. I never spent nine days down there. I have never spent more than four days in any one year, and in several years I never was able to get there at all.

What has this got to do with the charges and the allegations? The charges and the allegation is how did he get rid of the mortgage? And the mortgage is that if I had done what I was supposed to have done, I would have found some way to find out how the allocation was there. Because legally and theoretically, the reduction of the mortgage meant income was coming somewhere, even if I didn't receive it.

□ 1900

And I should have found that out because, at the end of the day, my accountant tells me after 20 years of research there would be no tax liability because of the deduction of the foreign tax, which was higher, because I was an American and because of depreciation. They changed it and said that because I sold the house that I was raised in that it did not allow me to take full credit that I could have done for that year. It means, at the end of the day, my accountant believes that I would be liable for \$5,000. Do I take that lightly? No.

As a Member of Congress, as a public servant, I should have a higher standard than most people. Whether I owed \$5,000 or \$5 million, it was wrong, but it certainly doesn't mean that I should be kicked out of the House and say that I caused disservice to this august body. I just hope none of you have ever made mistakes on your income taxes, because what I have done is I've gone back 20 years and I've waived all statutes, and I'm prepared to pay whatever price there is, and I hope that at the end of the day that will take care of that. That's the roughest one.

The second thing is that one would have you to believe that I received some type of a gift in housing, because the headline is that RANGEL had four subsidized apartments in New York. The fact that there is no law in having four subsidized apartments in New York, of course, is no account to anybody. I don't have four apartments.

Briefly, what happened is that, 20 years ago, the kids were grown. We got tired of paying the bills on our house and getting into oil and doing all those

things. My wife said let's move to an apartment. I'd spent all of my life on 32nd Street and Lenox Avenue. She finds a place on 35th and Lenox Avenue. I refused to leave Harlem then as I do now, and there was a place called Lenox Terrace, where we now live, that had so many vacancies.

At that time 20 years ago, there weren't a whole lot of people who could afford not to live in Harlem, who were rushing to get into Harlem. Crime was really high. There were a lot of vacancies there, but they did have a doorman, and I felt since I was away from home so much that it might provide some security to my wife. In that house, people knowing that Alma would want to leave, there was a popular reverend, a pastor, and he, too, was leaving Harlem and was leaving an apartment that he had. I did not know and did not care that the apartment that he managed to get for us actually had been two apartments. He had it as one apartment. I got a lease for one apartment. I paid rent for one apartment. There's no way in the world I can imagine what it looked like when it was two apartments, and I don't care what the architect says. Under the law, that is one apartment.

Ten years after I was in the apartment, my wife was notified by the landlord—incidentally, he was the one who was supposed to give me the gift. I wouldn't know what he looks like. I've never met him in my life or his agent, but he was saying that there was a studio apartment next to mine, and did I have any interest in it. They were really pushing apartments then. My wife says she didn't see any need for it.

I said, "Well, let's talk about this, Alma. You don't want my political friends to come here and talk in the living room. You get so tired of me doing my work, you know, while you're doing something else. You don't want any smoke here. I can't have a card game here. Let's take a look at this one room apartment."

I took it, and I can tell you that it saved my marriage. There's not a day when I'm home that I don't spend some time just sitting there. Sometimes it's reading. Sometimes it's studying. Sometimes the gang comes. Sometimes we raise a lot of devil. I pay the maximum rent for what cannot be described physically as any more than two apartments, but we can get two—the so-called fourth and third apartments.

It's hard for me to admit to those of you who have a lot of political problems that, for most all of my political life in Congress, I've never picked up the phone to ask anybody to give me any money because I'd never really had any problems. I did have a guy in Washington that would give a fundraiser—one in Washington and one in New York—but it's kind of hard, when you're not challenged, to ask for money, but I guess it was my personality or my seniority on the Ways and

Means Committee, one or the other. Somehow funds were coming in, so I hired somebody. We worked down at the political club. The money was coming in. He said he needed a little help. He thought that I should open up a headquarters. Well, I don't agree in spending a lot of money, but he said he'd heard that the Lenox Terrace, where I lived, had people living in apartments that were converted but that were not commercial for running McDonald's and other business.

I said, "Do what you want. We can afford to do it."

They got this apartment. A staff of two became a staff of three, four and five, and I guess the Republican campaign committee can tell you how successful I've been.

It reached the point where they said, "Look, Congressman. We've got too many people. There's no air conditioning here. We need more space. Things are going well. You're sending out a lot of checks. We will not renew the lease." This is before what happened in the paper.

I said, "Do what you have to do."

They spoke with the landlord and negotiated: an apartment with him for a larger staff, office accommodations in a place that was double the rent, much larger, right there in the Lenox Terrace, which means that everyone knew what they were doing and what other people were doing. We decided it would be best just to leave the Lenox Terrace in lieu of what happened because it was just too awkward.

That ends, once and for all, the whole idea of a gift. I paid the maximum rent. If I'd decided that because I wanted to please somebody that I should look for a marketplace rent, I would not know where to go, but I sure am not going to give the landlord what I think is a higher rent because I want to please somebody as to what is market rent, but if I'd left the apartment because of some foolish, stupid reason, the landlord would've come in, slapped some paint on it and doubled the rent. So, therefore, it would not be of any assistance to somebody of a lesser income.

Whatever doubts you may have, which I don't see how—I told somebody show me the gift, and I'll walk away. Leave it to the bipartisan Ethics Committee to decide. It's not only the right and fair thing to do. It's the only thing to do.

The last point gives me a little more difficulty. They are saying that I may have used my stationery to solicit funds for the City College of New York for an institution that the board of trustees has named the Charles Rangel Public School for Public Service.

I have to let you know that, on November 30, 1950, I was shot and left for dead in Korea, and I came home in '52. I had more medals, more self-esteem than any guy 22 years old should have. The only time it was shattered is when I went for a job and found out that nobody wanted heroes, that nobody wanted infantry men and that nobody want-

ed the expertise that I enjoyed in directing fire on the enemy to 18 155-millimeter Howitzers at 75 shell bombs on the enemy. So, it was clear that I not only was unemployed but that I was unemployable. It was clear in one day when I had my truck full of stuff on the street in the Garment Center that I joined the Army to avoid. The rain came; the boxes were scattered all over, and the policeman was cursing me out for blocking traffic. Sergeant RANGEL was being cursed out on a public street.

I dropped everything. I went to the VA, and I said, "I need some help." They told me that because I had to go back to high school that I couldn't go to college. I raised so much hell. Finally, because of the GI Bill—I was a high school dropout—I got the training to become a Member of Congress, a member of the Ways and Means Committee and become its chairman.

Am I overzealous about education? You bet your life. Do I go everywhere and tell businesspeople that you owe it to this country to assist us in making certain that Americans can produce, that we shouldn't be embarrassed of having to import people here who have knowledge in science and all of that? I want America to be as strong as it can be, and I'm going to do everything legally, morally and ethically possible to make certain that we support our young people and expose them to education.

This CCNY, this City College of New York, has excelled. Colin Powell and so many people had dreams and have succeeded. All I was saying is that we have thousands of Barack Obamas in the Black community. We have so few who are willing to get involved in public service. They go to Wall Street. They make their money and they're bright. What I want to do is to encourage minorities and be able to say, "Hey, you don't have to run for public office, but please understand the importance of public service." They said, "There should be a school for you to do that." I said, "Well, let's get a school. Let's do it." They said, "Let's do it."

Two, three days ago, I heard Secretary Rice talking to some group, and she was saying that she goes to so many countries and that she doesn't see people in the Foreign Service who look like her. Those who look like the gorgeous mosaic of America is not abroad. But she said, "Thanks to Congressman RANGEL, we have worked out a program where we go to the historically Black colleges where we train these people there. When they graduate, they not only have degrees, but they are members of the Foreign Service, and they learn to understand the great contribution they can make to this country." That was what I wanted to do.

I made certain that, in this letter, I did not ask for any public funds or for any kind of funds at all, but they said, because they knew that the reason I wanted these not-for-profit people,

these private people, to take a look and see whether they could support this not-for-profit public college, there may have been some stretch in the line because it was on stationery. Had I not had the seal that had the Capitol, it would have been all right.

I'm glad this happened because I'm going to find some way to do what I do, and I'm going to do it the way the Ethics Committee says to do it, but I hope I can get some of you to encourage the private sector to do what our government is not doing. Education is too important to leave to the local and State schools. Corporations have an obligation to help us to educate our people. Condoleezza Rice said it, and I truly know that you believe a failure to educate our young people is a threat to our national security. If for whatever reason the Federal Government is not doing it, everyone ought to do their bit. So, whatever the Ethics Committee says to do, we have to do.

Finally, I've changed my mind in bringing to your attention how they beat up on Mr. BOEHNER on the Tim Russert show: where he's been, how he got there and what he violated. At the end of the day, I think I'm trying to make certain that my presentation ends up on as positive a note as I can because of my longtime respect for my friend. Mr. BOEHNER said it was a big mistake and I regret it. I shouldn't have done it. It was an old practice in the House that had gone on for a long time. Well, I think he knows what I'm talking about.

If you made a mistake, I may have made a mistake.

I'll tell you one thing. The judgment of our mistakes should not be to attack each other. It should not be to defame us in front of our family and friends. Whatever difference that we had with each other, that's why we have the Ethics Committee. So, at the end of the day, that's how it's going to be resolved. We don't have that many issues that we've got to work with, perhaps, in a bipartisan way. Whatever we have to do because of the election we have to do, and I don't expect this short talk is going to change anything, but I do hope there is one thing that we keep in mind: that for those of us who are going to be here next year with a new administration, the last thing we have to do is to threaten each other politically and destroy the friendships and the camaraderie that we have worked so hard to try to restore.

I conclude by letting you know that some of you old-timers may know a guy named Guy Vander Jagt. Guy Vander Jagt was chairperson of the Republican Campaign Committee. Could he speak? Could he raise money? Was he partisan? Guy Vander Jagt was my friend. Guy Vander Jagt would come to my fund-raisers. I would stop over to his. His wife and my wife are the best of friends. Even though Guy Vander Jagt is gone, they asked me to speak in the Congress to say how he was loved by both sides. Was he a good Repub-

lican? Was he fierce? Was he eloquent? Was he liked? Yes.

I don't think I'll live long enough to see the days when we'll have that type of relationship. The little we do have let's not destroy. We have a big responsibility to our Nation and to this Congress. I know in my heart that my friend JOHN BOEHNER does not mean truly what he has said, and whoever has put him in the position where he felt that he had to say it, hey, it's campaign time. I understand it. It has to stop somewhere before we leave here. I hope it can stop now.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1915

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Speaker, I demand a point of personal privilege under the rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has not been made aware of the basis for the point of personal privilege. Does the gentleman seek recognition under unanimous consent?

Mr. BOEHNER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BOEHNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BOEHNER. I appreciate all my colleagues and their endurance in this. And you all should know that CHARLIE RANGEL and I are friends. We've had fierce debates. We've worked together on many bills, and he's someone who I talk to virtually every day in this House. And it pains me, it pains me to do what I had to do on behalf of my colleagues.

We all live under a system of laws; not only all of us, but all of the American people. Those of us that work in this Chamber, we work under a set of laws and a set of rules. And when the rules are violated, the court system doesn't take into effect whether you were aware of the rules or you were aware of the laws. You either violated the laws or you didn't.

And I say to my friend from New York that, considering the stories that occurred over the summer about the rent-controlled apartments, the fact that one of them was a campaign office, you could conjure up the fact that because it was rent-subsidized that it was, in fact, a campaign gift. And this latest round of stories—

Mr. RANGEL. Will you yield just on that one point?

Mr. BOEHNER. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. RANGEL. Rent-subsidized. If you lived a million years you could not tell where one subsidy came from. Stabilization and subsidies are entirely two different things. There is no subsidy involved. It's a cap.

Mr. BOEHNER. Reclaiming my time. And then this latest round of stories that the gentleman from New York was kind enough to share with all of us

raise serious questions, serious questions.

And I just—the point of the letter that was sent yesterday was to ask the gentleman if he would step aside until the Ethics Committee had time to investigate this.

I believe that the Ethics Committee needs to do its job, not just in this case, but in all cases. And I've been concerned for some time that the Ethics Committee has not been a functioning committee of the House. I understand the current circumstances. We all understand the current circumstances.

But I don't want to condemn the gentleman. I've never convicted the gentleman, nor would I, because he is my friend. But just because he's my friend doesn't mean that I can excuse him from the rules of the House or the law of our land.

And so I ask my colleagues to work with us. I believe, like CHARLIE does, that we, as a Congress, have to find a way to get beyond what's gone on around here over the last 7 or 8 years, that we have to find a way to work together.

If you look at the issues that CHARLIE and I have worked on, GEORGE MILLER and I have worked on, and a lot of other Members that I've worked on on both sides of the aisle, the big issues of our country will not get done by one side or the other. They will only be addressed in a bipartisan way if we're going to be successful. And we know we have big issues facing this country that are being ignored because we're too busy clawing at each other.

My intent here is not to claw at my friend from New York. My intent here is to have justice and to have all of us live by the rules of the House.

I'm sorry that I had to do it, but I have a job to do on behalf of my colleagues in this Chamber. I believe all of us are being held accountable and should be held accountable.

Yes, I've made mistakes, and I've paid for them. I just think that the sooner we get this cleaned up, the better.

But, in the meantime, in fairness to the Members of the House, that stepping aside would, in fact, be the right thing to do.

#### PREVENT ALL CIGARETTE TRAFFICKING ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4081, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4081, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 379, nays 12, not voting 42, as follows:



[Roll No. 584]

## YEAS—379

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Allen  
Altmire  
Andrews  
Arcuri  
Bachmann  
Bachus  
Baird  
Baldwin  
Barrett (SC)  
Barrow  
Bartlett (MD)  
Bean  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Biggett  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Bishop (UT)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt  
Boehner  
Bonner  
Bono Mack  
Boozman  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boustany  
Boyd (FL)  
Boyd (KS)  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)  
Braley (IA)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown, Corrine  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Buchanan  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Butterfield  
Calvert  
Camp (MI)  
Cannon  
Cantor  
Capito  
Capps  
Capuano  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson  
Carter  
Castle  
Castor  
Chabot  
Chandler  
Childers  
Clarke  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Cole (OK)  
Conaway  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cubin  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
Davis (KY)  
Davis, David  
Davis, Lincoln  
Davis, Tom  
Deal (GA)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.

Diaz-Balart, M.  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly  
Doolittle  
Doyle  
Drake  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Edwards (MD)  
Edwards (TX)  
Ehlers  
Ellison  
Emanuel  
Emerson  
Engel  
English (PA)  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Everett  
Fallin  
Farr  
Fattah  
Ferguson  
Filner  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fossella  
Foster  
Foxy  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallely  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Giffords  
Gilchrest  
Gillibrand  
Gingrey  
Gohmert  
Goode  
Goodlatte  
Gordon  
Granger  
Graves  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Hall (NY)  
Hall (TX)  
Hare  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Heller  
Hensarling  
Herger  
Herseth Sandlin  
Higgins  
Hill  
Hinchey  
Hirono  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hooley  
Hoyer  
Hunter  
Ingilis (SC)  
Inlee  
Israel  
Issa  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson-Lee  
(TX)  
Jefferson  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (IL)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones (NC)  
Jordan  
Kagen  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Keller  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kirk  
Klein (FL)  
Kline (MN)

Knollenberg  
Kucinich  
Kuhl (NY)  
LaHood  
Lamborn  
Lampson  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Latta  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeb sack  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Lungren, Daniel  
E.  
Lynch  
Mack  
Mahoney (FL)  
Maloney (NY)  
Manzullo  
Marchant  
Markley  
Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (CA)  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCaul (TX)  
McCollum (MN)  
McCotter  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McHugh  
McIntyre  
McKeon  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNulty  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Mica  
Michaud  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, Gary  
Miller, George  
Mitchell  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (KS)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Murphy, Tim  
Musgrave  
Myrick  
Nadler  
Neal (MA)  
Neugebauer  
Nunes  
Obey  
Oliver  
Pallone  
Pascarell  
Payne  
Pearce  
Perlmuter  
Peterson (PA)  
Petri  
Pickering  
Platts  
Poe  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Price (GA)  
Price (NC)  
Pryce (OH)  
Putnam  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Regula  
Rehberg  
Reichert  
Reynolds

Richardson  
Rodriguez  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rogers (MI)  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothman  
Royce  
Ruppersberger  
Ryan (OH)  
Ryan (WI)  
Sali  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schmidt  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Sestak  
Shadegg  
Shays  
Shea-Porter

Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuler  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sires  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Souder  
Space  
Speier  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stearns  
Stupak  
Sutton  
Tancredo  
Tanner  
Tauscher  
Taylor  
Terry  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thornberry  
Tiahrt  
Tiberi  
Tierney

Towns  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Udall (CO)  
Udall (NM)  
Upton  
Van Hollen  
Visclosky  
Walberg  
Walden (OR)  
Walsh (NY)  
Walz (MN)  
Wamp  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Weiner  
Welch (VT)  
Weldon (FL)  
Weller  
Wexler  
Whitfield (KY)  
Wilson (NM)  
Wilson (OH)  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman (VA)  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Yarmuth  
Young (FL)

## NAYS—12

Barton (TX)  
Broun (GA)  
Campbell (CA)  
Coble

Ellsworth  
Flake  
Kingston  
McHenry

Oberstar  
Paul  
Sullivan  
Young (AK)

## NOT VOTING—42

Baca  
Becerra  
Bilbray  
Blackburn  
Buyer  
Cardoza  
Cazayoux  
Cramer  
Dicks  
Feeney  
Gonzalez  
Grijalva  
Gutierrez  
Harman  
Hinojosa

Hodes  
Hulshof  
Johnson, Sam  
Lee  
Levin  
Linder  
Lofgren, Zoe  
McCrery  
Murtha  
Napolitano  
Ortiz  
Pastor  
Pence  
Peterson (MN)  
Pitts

Rangel  
Renzi  
Reyes  
Roybal-Allard  
Rush  
Salazar  
Saxton  
Serrano  
Solis  
Velázquez  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Westmoreland

□ 1941

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, due to personal matters, today I missed rollcall vote No. 576 on ordering the previous questions to provide for consideration of H.R. 3667, rollcall vote No. 577 on passage of H. Res. 1419 to provide for consideration of H.R. 3667, rollcall vote No. 578 on final passage of H.R. 1527, rollcall vote No. 579 on final passage of S. 2617. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea." On rollcall No. 580, on the motion that the Committee rise, rollcall vote No. 581, on agreeing to the Grijalva amendment to H.R. 3667, and rollcall vote No. 583, on final passage of H.R. 3667, I would have voted "aye." On rollcall vote No. 581, on agreeing to the Grijalva Amendment to H.R. 3667, and rollcall vote No. 584, on final passage of H.R. 4081, I would have voted "yea."

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO ENTERTAIN MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES RELATING TO H.R. 6532 ON LEGISLATIVE DAY OF THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 11, 2008

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be authorized to entertain motions to suspend the rules relating to H.R. 6532 on the legislative day of Thursday, September 11, 2008.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I was in my district this morning and was unable to return until after votes were called on rollcall 576, 577, 578, and 579. I would have voted "yea" on all of those bills.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 3667, MISSISSQUOI AND TROUT RIVERS WILD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY ACT OF 2008

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 3667, including corrections in spelling, punctuation, section and title numbering, cross-referencing, conforming amendments to the table of contents and short titles, and the insertion of appropriate headings.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

## BURN THE BOOKS PART II

(Mr. POE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, our country takes pride in the first amendment right of free speech and free press, but it seems that philosophy is no longer applicable when it comes to criticizing certain religions.

Random House Publishing has decided not to print the novel "The Jewel of Medina" because Islamic radicals are a bit upset. Apparently, American author Sherry Jones hurt some feelings by writing a fiction book about Muhammad's child bride Aisha. Now Random House has been intimidated into not publishing the book because a small radical group of Islamic individuals object. Random House has given in to the threats of the religious speech and press police.

Author Salman Rushdie, who was threatened by these same type of individuals years ago because of his book, "The Satanic Verses," said that, "This is censorship by fear."

These Islamic radicals go throughout the world and denounce free speech and free press if the content is critical of Islam. Further, they demand censorship of the offensive material. Radicals cannot control and suppress the first amendment because they don't agree with what people say or print. Too bad book publishers have given up their right to a free press because now a novel offends some religious group.

And that's just the way it is.

#### GIVE US A GOOD ENERGY BILL

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, during the August recess, I think a lot of my colleagues got the message from their constituents that they want an energy bill, they want energy independence, and they want us to start working on that right now.

I talked to some of my Democrat colleagues today, and I had an indication from them that we might have an energy bill next week. All I wanted to say to the leadership on the Democrat side is, Give us an energy bill that we can really support. Please don't give us a facade. Don't give us the frosting on the cake without the cake. We want an energy bill that will move us toward energy independence that will allow us to work and get energy from a whole host of sources, as well as the alternative sources that we're talking about in the new technologies.

Give us a good energy bill. Don't give us a piece of junk that we can't vote for.

□ 1945

#### NOW IS THE TIME TO ACT ON AN ENERGY POLICY

(Mr. BRADY of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I hoped to comment on the Democrat energy bill tonight, but it is still under construction in the back rooms.

What I don't understand is why this Congress, this Democrat Congress, stands in the way of the American people and does not allow a straight up-or-down vote on exploring for more energy here in America.

Our Republican plan is simple: use less energy, find more sources here in America, conserve more, bring the renewables online, but let's explore more for oil and gas in our deep ocean waters and arctic reserve. That's the only way we can have an affordable bridge to the future. We can reduce our dependence on foreign oil, and again, give some help to the families and small businesses and school districts across this country who are suffering because of high gas prices.

Now is the time to act. Now is the time. We need a straight up-or-down vote.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### WE SHOULDN'T USE FORCE AGAINST IRAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. McDERMOTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the sounds we are hearing and the signals we are seeing from the administration remind me of the months leading up to the invasion of Iraq. For all those supporters of the President who claimed 6 years ago that military intervention in Iraq would be the U.S.'s last option, we now know the war was the first, preordained and only option of the administration. They just had to cook the books to make the American people believe otherwise.

America has paid a very steep price: America has lost lives; Iraqis have lost lives; \$1 trillion lost; American moral leadership in the world lost. And we cannot afford to let this administration do it again with a military strike against Iran before the President and Vice President leave office in January.

The news of late is deeply troubling, and we have a responsibility to remind the Americans of the administration's penchant to conduct diplomacy with bullets and bombs.

I believe the people have the right to know and the right to demand this administration, and the Republican ticket for the Presidency, declare there be no military strike against Iran by U.S. forces or on our behalf by a U.S. ally like Israel unless the Congress votes for it.

My concerns come directly out of the reporting by credible, mainstream international news organizations that have built their reputation on credibility.

I enter into the RECORD a September 1 story from the Jerusalem Post. The headline is: "Dutch intel: U.S. to strike Iran in coming weeks."

[From the Jerusalem Post, Sept. 1, 2008]

DUTCH INTEL: U.S. TO STRIKE IRAN IN COMING WEEKS

(By JPost.com Staff)

The Dutch intelligence service, the AIVD, has called off an operation aimed at infiltrating and sabotaging Iran's weapons industry due to an assessment that a U.S. attack on the Islamic Republic's nuclear program is imminent, according to a report in the country's De Telegraaf newspaper on Friday.

The report claimed that the Dutch operation had been "extremely successful," and had been stopped because the U.S. military was planning to hit targets that were "connected with the Dutch espionage action."

The impending air-strike on Iran was to be carried out by unmanned aircraft "within weeks," the report claimed, quoting "well placed" sources.

The Jerusalem Post could not confirm the De Telegraaf report.

According to the report, information gleaned from the AIVD's operation in Iran has provided several of the targets that are to be attacked in the strike, including "parts for missiles and launching equipment."

"Information from the AIVD operation has been shared in recent years with the CIA," the report said.

On Saturday, Iran's Deputy Chief of Staff General Masoud Jazayeri warned that should the United States or Israel attack Iran, it would be the start of another World War.

On Friday, Ma'ariv reported that Israel had made a strategic decision to deny Iran military nuclear capability and would not hesitate "to take whatever means necessary" to prevent Teheran from achieving its nuclear goals.

According to the report, whether the United States and Western countries succeed in thwarting the Islamic Republic's nuclear ambitions diplomatically, through sanctions, or whether a U.S. strike on Iran is eventually decided upon, Jerusalem has begun preparing for a separate, independent military strike.

I also enter into the RECORD the August 29 Jerusalem Post story entitled, "Israel reaches strategic decision not to let Iran go nuclear."

[From the Jerusalem Post, online edition, Aug. 29, 2008]

ISRAEL REACHES STRATEGIC DECISION NOT TO LET IRAN GO NUCLEAR  
(By JPost.com Staff)

Israel will not agree to allow Iran to achieve nuclear weapons and if the grains start running out in the proverbial egg timer, Jerusalem will not hesitate to take whatever means necessary to prevent Iran from achieving its nuclear goals, the government has recently decided in a special discussion.

According to the Israeli daily Ma'ariv, whether the United States and Western countries will succeed in toppling the ayatollah regime diplomatically, through sanctions, or whether an American strike on Iran will eventually be decided upon, Jerusalem has put preparations for a separate, independent military strike by Israel in high gear.

So far, Israel has not received American authorization to use U.S.-controlled Iraqi airspace, nor has the defense establishment been successful in securing the purchase of advanced U.S.-made warplanes which could facilitate an Israeli strike.

The Americans have offered Israel permission to use a global early warning radar system, implying that the U.S. is pushing Israel to settle for defensive measures only.

Because of Israel's lack of strategic depth, Jerusalem has consistently warned over the past years it will not settle for a 'wait and see' approach and retaliate in case of attack, but rather use preemption to prevent any risk of being hit in the first place.

Ephraim Sneh a veteran Labor MK which has left the party recently, has sent a document to both U.S. presidential candidates, John McCain and Barack Obama. The eight-point document states that "there is no government in Jerusalem that would ever reconcile itself to a nuclear Iran. When it is clear Iran is on the verge of acquiring nuclear weapons, an Israeli military strike to prevent this will be seriously considered."

According to Ma'ariv, Sneh offered the two candidates the "sane, cheap and the only option that does not necessitate bloodshed." To prevent Iran's nuclear aspirations, Sneh wrote, "real" sanctions applied in concert by the U.S. and Europe is necessary. A total

embargo in spare parts for the oil industry and a total boycott of Iranian banks will topple, within a short time, the regime which is already pressured by a sloping economy and would be toppled by the Iranian people if they would have outside assistance.

The window of opportunity Sneh suggests is a year and a half to two years, until 2010.

Sneh also visited Switzerland and Austria last week in an attempt to lobby those two states. Both countries have announced massive long-term investments in Iranian gas and oil fields for the next decade.

"Talk of the Jewish Holocaust and Israel's security doesn't impress these guys," Sneh said wryly.

Hearing his hosts speak of their future investments, Sneh replied quietly "it's a shame, because Ido will light all this up." He was referring to Maj. Gen. Ido Nehushtan, the recently appointed commander of the Israeli Air Force and the man most likely to be the one to orchestrate Israel's attack on Iran's nuclear facilities, should this become the necessity.

"Investing in Iran in 2008," Sneh told his Austrian hosts, "is like investing in Krups Steelworks in 1938, it's a high risk investment." The Austrians, according to Sneh, turned pale.

In related news, Israel Radio reported that Iran has finished installing an additional 4,000 centrifuges in the Natanz uranium enrichment facility. The Islamic Republic also announced it will install an additional 3,000 centrifuges in coming months.

The pan-Arabic Al Kuds al Arabi reported Friday that Iran has equipped Hizbullah with longer range missiles than those it had before the Second Lebanon War and also improved the terror group's targeting capabilities.

According to the report, which The Jerusalem Post could not verify independently, Hizbullah would begin a massive rocket onslaught on targets reaching deep into Israel's civilian underbelly in case the Jewish State would launch an attack on Iran.

These and other news stories should remind us that this administration remains in office for several months but years ago forfeited their trust with the American people over the Iraq War.

What is especially worrisome to me is that the administration has shifted the Iraq war to the air in an effort to make it an antiseptic war that might be more acceptable to the American people. We're grateful that U.S. casualties in Iraq are down significantly, but when a war should never have been started, every single casualty is a price too high.

And today, the U.S. is an unwelcome occupier, and the administration is ignoring the wishes of the elected Iraqi Government to set a date to leave. Instead, the White House is trying to run their country and continue this war.

Bombs falling from 30,000 feet have the same devastating impact on innocent Iraq civilians as bullets and bombs at street level. We just don't hear about it much in the American news media. But I hear about it from people in the Middle East who wonder if we will ever leave Iraq and worry that an antiseptic aerial war will be used against Iran.

Where once we stood tall on the moral high ground, now decent people the world over question our motives, our resolve, and our moral leadership.

They fear, and so do I, that this administration will make the calculation that as long as we drop bombs from 30,000 feet, or fire cruise missiles from 300 miles offshore, the American people can be misled into another war. We must not let that happen.

The current leadership in Iran has few, if any, friends in this House today, and I am not one of them. But we cannot solve every challenge that confronts us with military confrontation. And we cannot meet other challenges when our moral high ground has turned into the shifting sands during this administration.

When Russia invades Georgia, who in the world is going to listen to the rhetoric of a U.S. President who invaded Iraq?

When Iraq says set a timetable to leave and this President says no, who in the world is going to listen to a President who says Iraq is a sovereign Nation?

And when this administration says they aren't planning a military strike against Iran, why would anyone in the world believe it when the fine print says all the options are still on the table?

Instead of occupying Iraq, the U.S. should be occupying the moral high ground, and we can start by stopping any effort to use force against Iran. Let's do it today before it's too late. We need, Mr. Speaker, a vote before we do anything against Iran.

#### WE NEED TO PROTECT OUR BORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE. Mr. Speaker, recently this country has been very concerned about something that's taking place in lands far, far away. It seems as though that the Russians have decided to invade the Republic of Georgia. Many Americans didn't even know where the Republic of Georgia was. Now, most of us know where it is and where it's located.

In fact, the government has been doing much lately, talking about this invasion of another country and very concerned about the people of South Ossetia that have now occupied or have their country or territory occupied by the Russians. In fact, the country is so upset about this, our country, we have sent \$1 billion to Georgia to help Georgia, supposedly for humanitarian aid.

But we seem to be somewhat concerned—and our rhetoric as a Nation is that one sovereign country has invaded the sovereign country of another, concerned about the borders of the Republic of Georgia.

It's interesting to me that we are concerned about the sanctity and sovereignty of other Nations and their borders, but yet back here at home we seem not to care about the sovereignty and sanctity of our own borders. We

protect the borders of other Nations throughout the world. We're concerned about the border of Georgia, but yet this country still has no policy about being concerned and enforcing border security of our own Nation.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm talking about the southern border with Mexico, and I'm talking about the northern border of Canada. Yet every day we still have hundreds of people crossing into the United States illegally. It's an invasion into our country. Without permission people are coming into this country, and they're here for all purposes. Sure we hear about those who are over here trying to look for jobs, that supposedly Americans won't take.

But there are also other people coming over here. We get the good, the bad and the ugly because we don't secure our borders, and right now we're getting a lot of bad and ugly. Mr. Speaker, if you don't believe me, I will take you down to the Texas-Mexico border and show you how the violence has gotten worse and worse because this Nation refuses to protect its own border from people coming in without permission. That's very unfortunate.

We are in a Presidential campaign. We hear a lot of talk about all kinds of issues, but yet I have not heard from either Presidential candidate about a plan to secure our borders. They're talking about everything else. I'd be glad to take either one or both of them down to the Texas-Mexico border and show them what it's like, the porous border, because we don't protect the sovereignty of our own Nation.

But yet we're concerned about the Republic of Georgia halfway around the world and their border. Doesn't make much sense to me. We should be just as concerned about our own borders as we are about borders of other people and give the money to our own people on our own border to secure it.

We send \$1 billion quickly to the Republic of Georgia. What could our border patrol agents do with \$1 billion on the Texas-Mexico border? They could do a whole lot more. And they're not getting it. They're not getting the support that they need. They're doing the best job they can. The sheriffs all along the border, from San Diego all the way to Brownsville, they're doing the best they can.

But let me tell you something, Mr. Speaker, the drug cartels have more money, they outgun our border security officials, and they're more tenacious and they're doing everything they can to come into the United States illegally. Yes, we're getting all of them, we're getting everybody because we refuse to secure our border.

And we don't need to do a whole lot except enforce the laws we already have. It's already illegal to come into the United States without permission. Why don't we enforce that law? We are trying to enforce the border security of Georgia. Let's enforce the border security of our own Nation. That's the public duty our government has.

We can work out the issues of what to do with people that are here illegally down the road. America will do the right thing, but we can never deal with that issue until we secure the border.

One of the things we ought to do is enforce the rule of law, and if businesses choose to hire folks that are illegally in the country and they know they're illegal, those business owners need to be prosecuted under current law. We see a few of those CEOs be carted off to jail in handcuffs, maybe they'll quit hiring folks that are illegally in the country. That's just one answer, but it's already the law.

So I encourage our government: enforce the law, protect our borders, secure our Nation first. That is the duty, obligation, and moral duty of our government.

And that's just the way it is.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### UNJUST PROSECUTION OF FORMER U.S. BORDER PATROL AGENTS RAMOS AND COMPEAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I met with Monica Ramos, the wife of imprisoned U.S. border patrol agent Ignacio Ramos. I also met with her father, Mr. Joe Loya.

As the Members of this House are aware, in February of 2006, Agents Ramos and Compean were convicted of shooting and wounding a Mexican drug smuggler who brought \$1 million worth of marijuana across our border into Texas. The two agents were sentenced to 11 and 12 years in prison respectively. They have been in Federal prison, in solitary confinement, for 595 days.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to be distressed by the actions of U.S. Attorney Johnny Sutton and the prosecutors in this case.

Like thousands of Americans across the country, I was extremely disappointed by the ruling announced on July 28, 2008, by the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. The Court affirmed all convictions except those for tampering with an official proceeding, but this case is not closed.

□ 2000

A conviction secured on the testimony of a known drug smuggler should not stand. The same drug smuggler who told the Ramos and Compean jury that he did not carry a gun the day of the shooting also told the jury he was just a one-time offender who needed

money for his sick mother. Since the agents' conviction, however, the Mexican drug smuggler was convicted for additional smuggling offenses. His testimony against the agents has been proven completely unreliable.

Those of us who have urged a pardon for Ramos and Compean will continue to support them in their future legal appeals, and we will work tirelessly to ensure that the miscarriage of justice is corrected. The details of this case deserve an unbiased review by the U.S. Department of Justice. I have also asked JOHN CONYERS, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, to hold hearings to examine the prosecution of these agents who were doing their job to protect our border.

Questions surrounding the prosecution of this case deserve to be answered. For example, why was not the jury allowed to hear crucial evidence that the smuggler was a repeated offender? And why did the prosecutor charge the agents under a statute that was intended for violent criminals carrying guns, not for law enforcement officers acting in the line of duty?

Mr. Speaker, nothing can erase the suffering these agents have undergone and the months they have spent in prison in solitary confinement away from their families, but I want the families of Ramos and Compean to know that my colleagues on both sides of the political aisle and I will continue to do all we can to see this miscarriage of justice corrected. It is my hope and prayer that one day soon these two heroes will be home with their families.

Mr. Speaker, I close by asking God to continue to bless our men and women in uniform and their families. And I ask God to please continue to bless the families of agents Ramos and Compean. And I ask God to continue to bless America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. WOOLSEY addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### SUNSET MEMORIAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I stand once again before this House with yet another Sunset Memorial.

It is September 10, 2008 in the land of the free and the home of the brave, and before the sun set today in America, almost 4,000 more defenseless unborn children were killed by abortion on demand. That's just today, Mr. Speaker. That's more than the number of innocent lives lost on September 11 in this country, only it happens every day.

It has now been exactly 13,015 days since the tragedy called *Roe v. Wade* was first

handed down. Since then, the very foundation of this Nation has been stained by the blood of almost 50 million of its own children. Some of them, Mr. Speaker, cried and screamed as they died, but because it was amniotic fluid passing over the vocal cords instead of air, we couldn't hear them.

All of them had at least four things in common. First, they were each just little babies who had done nothing wrong to anyone, and each one of them died a nameless and lonely death. And each one of their mothers, whether she realizes it or not, will never be quite the same. And all the gifts that these children might have brought to humanity are now lost forever. Yet even in the glare of such tragedy, this generation still clings to a blind, invincible ignorance while history repeats itself and our own silent genocide mercilessly annihilates the most helpless of all victims, those yet unborn.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps it's time for those of us in this Chamber to remind ourselves of why we are really all here. Thomas Jefferson said, "The care of human life and its happiness and not its destruction is the chief and only object of good government." The phrase in the 14th Amendment capsulizes our entire Constitution. It says, "No State shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law." Mr. Speaker, protecting the lives of our innocent citizens and their constitutional rights is why we are all here.

The bedrock foundation of this Republic is the clarion declaration of the self-evident truth that all human beings are created equal and endowed by their Creator with the unalienable rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. Every conflict and battle our Nation has ever faced can be traced to our commitment to this core, self-evident truth.

It has made us the beacon of hope for the entire world. Mr. Speaker, it is who we are.

And yet today another day has passed, and we in this body have failed again to honor that foundational commitment. We have failed our sworn oath and our God-given responsibility as we broke faith with nearly 4,000 more innocent American babies who died today without the protection we should have given them.

So Mr. Speaker, let me conclude this Sunset Memorial in the hope that perhaps someone new who heard it tonight will finally embrace the truth that abortion really does kill little babies; that it hurts mothers in ways that we can never express; and that 13,015 days spent killing nearly 50 million unborn children in America is enough; and that it is time that we stood up together again, and remembered that we are the same America that rejected human slavery and marched into Europe to arrest the Nazi Holocaust; and we are still courageous and compassionate enough to find a better way for mothers and their unborn babies than abortion on demand.

Mr. Speaker, as we consider the plight of unborn America tonight, may we each remind ourselves that our own days in this sunshine of life are also numbered and that all too soon each one of us will walk from these Chambers for the very last time.

And if it should be that this Congress is allowed to convene on yet another day to come, may that be the day when we finally hear the cries of innocent unborn children. May that be the day when we find the humanity, the courage, and the will to embrace together our human and our constitutional duty to protect these, the least of our tiny, little American

brothers and sisters from this murderous scourge upon our Nation called abortion on demand.

It is September 10, 2008, 13,015 days since *Roe versus Wade* first stained the foundation of this Nation with the blood of its own children; this in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

#### STEM CELL RESEARCH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this summer has been a breath-taking one for stem cell researchers around the world, but not because of embryonic stem cells or cloning. Building on important work published last year showing that it is possible to reprogram an adult cell back to its primitive embryonic-like state, researchers led by Doug Melton at Harvard University have done what was thought impossible only a few short years ago. Melton and his team used mice to show that it is possible to directly reprogram support cells or exocrine cells of the pancreas into insulin-producing beta cells without ever removing any cells from the pancreas. Amazingly, it appears that one adult cell type has been directly and specifically transformed into another adult cell type. In other words, a simple injection of three critical reprogramming factors successfully produced insulin-producing beta cells and gave patients with diabetes and their families new reason to hope in the power of regenerative medicine.

Melton and his colleagues have brought us one step closer to what many have called the "holy grail" of regenerative medicine. He has shown that, in principle, it is possible to induce the body to heal itself by reprogramming one cell type into another. Imagine that; your beta cells can no longer make insulin and you are diabetic, perhaps because of immune destruction of your insulin-producing cells like in Type I diabetes, or perhaps because, like in Type II diabetes, your insulin-producing cells have just given up.

If the work Melton describes can be reproduced in human patients, diabetes patients would have to receive a simple injection, maybe two or three times, and with that, their pancreas could resume producing insulin and they would be cured of their diabetes, no longer requiring insulin injections, no longer requiring painful pinpricks.

Of course, Melton's work is a long way from the clinic. Mice are not people, and some of the details must be modified to ensure that the injection is safe and won't cause tumors. But this work represents an enormous step forward and should be pursued with all of the resources NIH can provide.

This exciting news comes on the heels of another announcement also this summer, that researchers from

Harvard and Columbia have used the reprogramming protocol to create 21 disease-specific stem cell lines that will enable researchers to intimately study diseases such as Lou Gehrig's disease, Type I diabetes, Parkinson's and muscular dystrophy. And it is important to note that this technique also does not require the creation, destruction or even the presence of human embryos. These cells may not be ready to transplant into humans in the near term, but they will be available for research today and for use in screening for drugs.

So in a few short months, the promise of regenerative medicine comes closer to reality. Just last year, scientists and cloning advocates told us that we had to do human cloning—or at least to create cloned human embryos—so that we could accomplish these two goals that were deemed essential for moving regenerative medicine forward; creating disease-specific cell lines, and regenerating stem cells that could be a perfect match for patients affected by these diseases.

Both of these goals have been accomplished with the reprogramming protocol; no cloning, no human embryo stem cells required. To say it another way, there is no medical reason to proceed with research into cloning human embryos for their stem cells because that science is obsolete, it is more cumbersome, it is more expensive. We have a better, quicker, easier way to do it.

Now, I will note that these researchers who were involved with these breath-taking breakthroughs have done the politically correct thing and have said we still have to move forward with embryo stem cell research for compelling reasons. What those compelling reasons are I do not know. And I disagree with them. It cannot be denied that research is moving forward at a breakneck speed, and the Bush policy is still fully in place.

This work also lends more support for all the adult stem cell work that we have been talking about in this body for years. For years, embryonic stem cell research advocates have claimed that only embryonic stem cells can be transformed this way. Now we have direct evidence that it is not necessary. Science is moving beyond the debate. Science is taking us in a direction of ethically responsible research.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### UNFAIR TRADE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KAGEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to present some of the stories from northeast Wisconsin, a region in the country known as "Paper Valley."

We have, for over 150 years in Wisconsin, been the leaders in the paper industry, not just paper manufacturing, but paper research, designing new ways and new methods of manufacturing and using paper products all throughout the world. We have led the way because we've invested our educational system, our time and energy in developing the industry. And now, across the country, all the paper industry is imperilled because of unfair, unbalanced trade deals, and a trading partner that breaks the rules, and that is Communist China.

Recently, in November, the International Trade Commission ruled that there was illegal paper coming into the United States, but there was no damage, no damages to the paper industry here in these United States. Well, shortly thereafter, New Page Corporation closed the Niagara Paper Mill in Niagara, Wisconsin, displacing hundreds of workers who had been there for generations.

More recently, several days ago, in Kimberly, Wisconsin, the Kimberly Mill—and you've heard of Kimberly Clark, you've heard of Kleenex, you've heard of other paper products and Huggies and diapers—listen, Kimberly, the only mill that they've had, has been closed and shut down, shut down because of the illegal competition from Asian governments like both South Korea and China.

The decision by the International Trade Commission was that there were no damages. Well, I beg to differ. In my office, I have a scroll signed by nearly 5,000 people from Kimberly and the surrounding villages who have been damaged. They are real people with real damages. One of the families, the Van Zeelands, are here with me in picture form. Bruce and his wife Nancy have three children, Alicia, Scott and Courtney. And here is his statement which I read on the floor this morning, "It turned our life upside down. Working at one company for 28 years and having no other skills to compete in this horrible job market. My wife is struggling to find a full-time job now. We cannot help out our three kids with college. We worry about losing our home." And he's not alone. There are hundreds of other workers and other families with real damages that the International Trade Commission may not have considered.

What about the family of Tom Sternhagen, who had worked for 29 years at the Kimberly mill? His wife Maureen, his son Ben and daughter Lexi, and here's what he has to say. "Can't pay the mortgage. Can't pay the property taxes. Our son can't go to college. We have no more health insurance. Can't make car payments. This is nothing but corporate greed with no regard for human life." That is Tom Sternhagen.

These are the views of normal, hard-working people in northeast Wisconsin who are suffering because of unfair trade deals and an administration that will not allow the rule of law to take place.

The International Trade Commission got it wrong: There are real damages throughout Paper Valley and throughout northeast Wisconsin.

Now, what's it going to take? What's it going to take to wake up America? We've been bleeding our jobs overseas when instead we should be shipping our values overseas, not our jobs. As Niagara, Wisconsin goes, so goes our Nation. And as Kimberly goes, so goes our Nation as well.

It's time for us here in the House of Representatives to work together across party lines and make certain that we design balanced trade deals such that when a ship comes over from China with \$50 million worth of goods and materials, they take back \$50 million worth of goods and materials made by our hardworking Americans.

Look, given a level playing field, we can out-compete and out-work anybody. We are the most productive people ever on Earth. We have had a successful middle class only because of our work ethic and the fact that we've had fair trade deals, free trade. The CAFTA and NAFTA style trade deals are nothing more than a free giveaway of American jobs.

It's time for America to wake up. Yes, let's wake up together, let's roll up our sleeves, let's work together in this House and in this next election. Let's elect a President who can think things all the way through, someone who is on the side of the Van Zeeland family, someone who is on our side for a change.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ELLISON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DEFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MORAN of Kansas addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. BACHUS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. FOXX addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WOLF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PRICE of Georgia addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### ENERGY CRISES AFFECTING AMERICANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATTA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, I represent one of the largest, if not the largest, ag districts in the State of Ohio. Also, according to the National Manufacturers Association, I represent one of the top 10 manufacturing districts in the country. And over this August break that we had, I was across my district—north, south, east and west—having a lot of meetings with farmers and a lot of meetings with our manufacturers. And the word wasn't all that good. Farmers were telling me that on many a day they're burning between \$800 and \$1,000 a day for diesel. They're paying much higher costs for fertilizer and chemicals—and in some cases these are up 3 to 3.5 times as much as they were 2 to 3 years ago.

Manufacturers: Not only the cost of shipping being up, but also the cost of the product that they had to produce with. They took me into the warehouses at the factories and they said, you know, a year ago, if you would have been here, this entire warehouse would have been full of the product that we needed to produce what we need to make our goods with. And today, it is only a quarter full. But that's the same price that we paid last year for this year, only a quarter. And it was an oil-based product. They've

got a problem, because as that price keeps going up, they have to make tough decisions on manufacturing what they're going to do in Ohio.

You know, we were talking about it just not affecting the farmers and manufacturers out there, but it also affects everyone. For the man and woman on the street, when it comes to thinking about their retirement and their future and putting their kids through college, they have to think, well, are we going to put that in the gas tank, in the oil tank for fuel this winter and not buy that new car or that new washing machine that might be produced in the northern part of Ohio?

I was fortunate enough earlier this summer to go to ANWR with 10 other Members. And we went up there, we saw Prudhoe Bay and what was being done there, and also looking at what was right across from the line of the river of ANWR. And ANWR, if you don't know, is the size of South Carolina, about 19 million acres. We're looking at an area that was set aside in 1980 of what they call section 1002 of about 1.5 million acres of that. And when you get right down to it, all we're talking about in this whole debate, when we're talking about ANWR, is an area of about 2,000 acres. And that translates to about 3.5 square miles in size. But we've got to do it. Because what's happening right now is, when the Alaskan pipeline was at its height, it was carrying about 2.1 million barrels of oil a day.

□ 2015

Today it's carrying 700,000. We are losing about 15 percent capacity every year in that pipeline. When it gets down to 3,000 barrels a day, it will no longer be able to flow and bring that oil south. That's a real concern because right now we're importing 70 percent of the oil used in this country, 70 percent.

So what we need to do is be able to take that oil that's over in ANWR, about 10.3 billion barrels, and we can put that 1 million barrels a day into that pipeline and bring it south.

And why is that important? Well, it's important that we do things here in this country because right now we're talking about having potentially about 86 billion barrels offshore, we have about 2.1 trillion barrels of oil shale, we're looking at around 420 trillion cubic feet of natural gas that's all off-limits right now. We also have 24 percent of the world's coal reserves. We have that technology, and some of that was invented in my own district, to have clean coal technology. Because we don't have these surprises that we wake up to like we did today that the OPEC countries have decided to cut back on production by about 520,000 barrels of oil over the next 40 days. Immediately the price of crude went up. Immediately we saw that, after watching the price go up and up and up to about \$147 a barrel, it was back under \$100 a barrel just briefly. And it's time that this country take control of its



own destiny when it comes to energy, and that's why we need the all-of-the-above strategy. That's nuclear, that's clean coal technology, that's making sure that we use hydroelectric, that we are producing, that we are making sure that we have oil and natural gas because we are going to need that oil, we're going to need that natural gas for the next 20 to 25 years.

We also have to look at the alternatives because when we went to ANWR, we stopped in Colorado and saw what they were doing out there in the National Renewable Laboratory dealing with solar, wind, hydrogen, ethanol, and biodiesel, and that's interesting to me because it's all happening in my district, the Fifth Congressional District of Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, it's time for us to act.

#### SKYROCKETING GAS PRICES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. KELLER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KELLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to discuss the problem of skyrocketing gas prices. When a single mom in Orlando, Florida, is paying \$80 to fill up her minivan, that's a crisis. The American people deserve some straight talk, and here it is: The main component of a price of gasoline at the pump is crude oil. Crude oil is a commodity governed by the law of supply and demand. Therefore, we must increase our supply and reduce our demand. To increase our supply, where is the single largest source of untapped crude oil in the United States? It's in Alaska in an area called ANWR, specifically in a section called 1002.

I recently went to Alaska and toured the entire northern slope, including the 1002 section of ANWR. I will tell you why I did. The critics of Alaska oil drilling say three things about ANWR:

They say, first, don't drill there because there's only a trivial amount of oil. Then they tell us that it would ruin the pristine wilderness. And, finally, they say don't do it because it will hurt the wildlife there, particularly the caribou and the polar bear. Let me address all three issues head-on as someone who has personally been there.

First, is there a trivial amount of oil there? There's 10.4 billion barrels of oil there, according to the United States Department of Interior. And 10.4 billion barrels of oil is enough to provide all of my home State of Florida's energy needs for 29 years; 10.4 billion barrels of oil is enough to pump 1 million barrels of oil a day every single day for the next 30 years. Does that sound like a trivial amount of oil to you?

The next thing we heard is that it's a pristine wilderness. You can't possibly drill there. Well, I went there. I went to the town of Kaktovik, the only village of ANWR, and I looked out and was a little surprised by what I saw,

and I'll tell you what I saw. It was a flat, barren tundra. It looked like the surface of the moon, not some rain forest-style wilderness. There was not a tree within 100 miles. And as I stood there with the leader of Kaktovik, Mr. Felton Rexford, the leader of the local Eskimo tribe, I said, "Where are all the trees? Where's the wilderness?"

He said, "Congressman, there is no wilderness here. There are no trees. The closest tree is over 100 miles away."

When you look at the size of ANWR, 19 million acres, the size of South Carolina, you have to realize that the drilling that we're proposing is in a limited 2,000-acre section of 1002. That means literally 99.99 percent of ANWR is off-limits and the tiny area that we would drill is a flat, frozen, barren tundra. To put that in perspective, it would be the size of a stamp on a football field.

The next issue: This would hurt the wildlife, particularly caribou and polar bear. Well, there are 800,000 caribou in Alaska, 5,000 polar bear. I saw them both on my trip. I can tell you the numbers for both are up over the last 30 years, each and every year, according to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. In fact, next door to ANWR is Prudhoe Bay, which is an existing oil field that's owned by the State, and we had caribou there in the mid 1970s to the tune of 3,000. They have increased since then tenfold up to 30,000.

So if those reasons aren't valid, what are the real reasons we are not drilling in ANWR? Well, here is a quote from the head of the Sierra Club, Mr. Carl Pope, and he says, "We are better off without cheap gas." Better off without cheap gas. Tell the single mom paying \$80 to fill up her minivan that she's better off without cheap gas. Tell the airline employees who all just lost their jobs that they're better off without cheap gas. Tell the small business employees who were just laid off that their families are better off without cheap gas. Tell the public school superintendent that had to switch to a 4-day week because he can't afford the money for the buses that our children are better off without cheap gas.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are hurting. We want you to put the ordinary Americans above the radical fringe environmental groups. We want you to give us an up-or-down vote on the American Energy Act. We want you to do it this September before taking another vacation and take care of business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TIM MURPHY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### ENERGY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, there are a number of points I want to talk about tonight on energy. But first I want to say that sometimes people get the feeling that we Republicans refer to alternative energy as something that's kind of window dressing because all we want to do is drill.

I have been working with alternative energy issues for over a decade here in Congress. In my district we now have the largest integrated soy diesel plant in the world that Dreyfus has put near Claypool just outside of Warsaw, Indiana. I recently gave an award that I have, a Johnny Appleseed award, who's actually a real person buried in Ft. Wayne, to a local company, Sweetwater Music, which is the greatest online music company in the United States and in the world because it looks like they are going to be certified as the first gold business building in the State of Indiana, at full green standards, first gold higher than platinum. And they're doing it and they did it in a way and the reason I wanted to highlight them is they can pay for the cost of their building with what they've saved in energy. I mean it pays for itself. A green building does not have to be a drawback.

At the same time, Merry Lea Environmental Learning Center done by Goshen College also has a platinum standard building. I believe that the wind power is a real alternative. Parker-Hannifin in New Haven, Indiana, I have an earmark set aside to help them with their project. They do coolant systems, and they believe they can get 20 to 40 percent more energy out of each wind turbine by changing the coolant standards. I have worked with solar energy in my district. Water Furnace, a company just highlighted in the New York Times in the last week, by recycling water for heating and cooling, can save an untold number of power plants in the United States if we do that. Nevertheless, representing the number one manufacturing district in the United States.

Let me just say this: We need coal, nuclear, and drilling as well as all these alternative energies. I have the largest pickup plant in the world that does the Silverado and the Sierra. You aren't going to power this if we don't have enough oil and gas. I have two huge SDI steel plants that take more energy to make the steel than cities of probably 75,000 to 100,000, possibly even double that, to 200,000, and everything in those cities to power those steel plants. Five new core facilities. Valbruna Steel. We aren't going to do this with a windmill standing up. Those are supplemental power systems.

But if we're not going to have every company moving to China, we have to have more energy in this country. The motor homes are not going to be powered by a little solar panel. And they're getting hammered right now, and 58 percent are in my district. The international trucks are not going to be



powered by alternative energy. We need basic energy.

And I want to talk specifically tonight about one. We hear about shale oil. This is what it looks like: layers of rock, and then there is a layer that has hydrocarbons that are packed in much like other oil that are in a solid piece like this. This basically is the equivalent of a gold nugget in the gold area because you can see here it is a piece of basically oil that by heating technology, this turns into high grade oil. We have 800 billion barrels of this. We pump right now in the United States 20 million. We have 800 billion in just the west Colorado, southwest Wyoming, and Utah basin. This is not the Rocky Mountains. It's not by the Grand Teton. It's not by the Rocky Mountain National Park. It's in the big basin in between the mountains because that's where you have the foliage and things that are packed together to do this.

Now, you can do it in open-pit mining like tar sands, and that's what you see a lot in the news. But the Mahogany Research Project that Shell Oil has, and you can find it on the Internet because they have now gone public for a reason I will mention in a minute, and Chevron have ways to do this in the ground so you don't have open-pit mining. They've already extracted enough in their pilot projects that we were able to use it in our planes. We don't need oil at \$120. Obviously at \$40 it isn't profitable. But in between there we have a lot of room to work to get this out of the ground.

The reason they have gone public, because they were nearing the point of a larger scale project, the House of Representatives and the Senate banned shale oil drilling. The project has stopped cold. They have laid off the engineers. Chevron and Shell have had to stop. One project has gone ahead on the open-pit mining. But the new stories in Colorado—this is a huge debate right now. Just about a month ago I went out. They have now opened it so Members of Congress can see it because they were trying to keep this technology from each other and the different companies, but basically Shell and Chevron have gone public with this technology because they were about to make it public. But we banned it, 800 billion barrels in the United States that does not have open-pit mining, that in the one experimental that they did already, they have already done the recovery of. It's intense when they do it, but down in the ground, they basically freeze the area around it, as you can see in the Mahogany Project, and get it out.

If we're going to keep industry in America, we have to come up with American energy strategies. Do everything, including shale oil.

□ 2030

#### THE DEFICIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 18, 2007, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. SUTTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. SUTTON. I am happy to be here today. We are here with some of the other Members of the freshman class, the class of 2006, and I have heard some folks on the other side of the aisle in recent moments talk about the fact that the American people deserve some straight talk. We could not agree more. And that is why we are here today, to talk about some of the things that aren't being talked about quite as loudly on the other side of the aisle.

Recently, earlier this week, the administration released its final mid-session review of the budget. The new budget document showed a record deficit for 2009, confirming that in 8 years this administration will have turned the largest surpluses in history into the largest deficits in history.

The dismal fiscal record is, unfortunately, just one aspect of this administration's failed economic record. But is that what the administration says to the American people?

Now I just want us to take a moment and look at some of the comments that have been coming out, not only from the administration, but from the other side of the aisle in this body.

In November of 2007, President George W. Bush, the administration, said, "Sure, there's some challenges facing us, but the underpinnings of our economy are strong, and we are a resilient economy." And then, in December of 2007, he said, "This economy is pretty good. There's definitely some storm clouds and concerns, but the underpinning is good." And that was complemented by the leader of the Republicans here in the House, who said in July of this year, July 21 of 2008, "While the economy is slow, we are still seeing growth, and frankly, I have got to tell you, I am shocked." And then he said way back in October of 2006, Minority Leader BOEHNER, said as follows, "Today's announcement by President Bush confirms that the pro-growth economic policies put in place by Republicans are working as planned to spur economic growth and reduce the deficit." That was JOHN BOEHNER, October 11, 2006, Looking forward, trying to suggest that the policies that have been pursued by this administration have benefited the American people.

Well, I am really glad that we have this opportunity to have the American people join us this evening to talk about the real facts. And they are not pleasant because it's a sad fact about some of the things that are happening out there.

You know, these two, the administration, the President, and Minority Leader BOEHNER, they are not the only people out there telling the American people that the economy is good. Not so long ago, in the not the distant past, we heard a top economic advisor to Senator McCain tell us that our prob-

lems, our economic problems, they are all in our head. In essence, he said that we are suffering from a mental recession.

You know, he called our country a Nation of whiners. Well, I have to tell you guys that as a Congresswoman from Ohio in the 13th District, that the people I represent, they are not whiners. They have, unfortunately, too many of them, felt the painful consequences of the failures of the last 8 years of this administration.

So I am grateful that you're here tonight to help us describe, and frankly, the important thing is hold accountable this administration for the failures that it is trying to disown.

The current administration, you all will know, is going to leave this Nation with the largest deficit in history. I'm sure my colleagues here with me tonight are going to talk about that. And the debt has ballooned as well. The economic growth has been, to give a complimentary spin, has been anemic, and thousands, thousands of jobs have been lost, household incomes have fallen, and the President's fiscal policies have imposed an amazingly heavy debt burden on America's families.

You know, I'd like to yield at this time to the distinguished gentleman here tonight, Representative PETER WELCH from Vermont, who has been a tremendous agent of change in this body, and I look forward to seeing what this gentleman is going to be able to do, because it's going to be a lot when we have more to work with in the next administration.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I thank my friend, Representative SUTTON. This evening gives us an opportunity to take account, to look at the record, and reveal it to the American people. We are in a season close to an election, where the American people are going to have to make a decision, and it's going to be an extraordinarily consequential decision. In the fog of a campaign, there's an awful lot of rhetoric back and forth, where those who have not done much try to conceal it with claims that they did, and try to shoot down the progress that has been made.

Now we all know that when we get going, and we are going to solve our problems, it's going to have to be working together. We have been doing our best to do that. But what we have to do tonight is lay out what the record has been.

What I want to talk about briefly are two areas; one is deficit, to continue what my friend, Representative SUTTON was talking about, and the other is on Iraq. The reason I want to talk about them specifically is because it is important for the American people to know what they can expect from our friends on the other side who have a clear record, and it is one that they are accountable for, but it has to be one that Americans are aware of.

On deficits, taking up on what you said, let me just read some quotes from

members of the administration to remind the American people of what was promised, and then lay out some facts about what actually was done.

"Our budget will run a deficit that will be small and short term." George Bush, in January of 2003. "We can proceed with tax relief without fear of budget deficits even if the economy softens. Projections for the surplus in my budget are cautious and conservative." George Bush, March 27, 2001.

"We are holding down government spending and reforming government, and the good news is the deficit is coming down." OMB Director Jim Nussle, June 22, 2006. "I don't like deficits, I don't want deficits, and I won't pretend deficits don't matter." OMB Director Jim Nussle, March 12, 2003.

"Today's announcement by President Bush confirms that the pro-growth economic policies put in place by Republicans are working as planned to spur economic growth and reduce the deficit. Republicans are meeting our commitments to the American taxpayers by exercising fiscal restraint in promoting economic policies this create jobs, all efforts which have produced a strong economy that is working to drive down and eventually eliminate our deficit." JOHN BOEHNER, October 11, 2006.

What are the facts? That is the rhetoric. What are the facts? President Bush and congressional Republicans, his allies, have turned a projected 10-year, 10-year surplus of \$5.6 trillion into a projected 10-year deficit of \$3.4 trillion. That is a swing of \$9 trillion in one Presidency. When President Bush took office, there was a projected surplus of \$710 billion for fiscal year 2009.

President Bush's budget will create a \$407 billion deficit for fiscal year 2009. That is a swing of over \$1 trillion.

Under the Bush administration, Republicans created the five largest—one, two, three, four, five—five largest budget deficits in American history, \$378 billion, \$413 billion, \$318 billion, \$407 billion, and \$438 billion now projected.

The first 42 Presidents, the first 42 American President's, borrowed a total of \$1 trillion. That was during wars, by the way; World War I, World War II, the Korean conflict, Vietnam, combined. That is the total amount borrowed from foreign governments and financial institutions.

In the 7½ years of the Bush Presidency, President Bush has borrowed more than \$1.6 trillion. He borrowed more in 7½ years than 42 Presidents did in over 100 years of our history.

When President Bush took office, we had a national debt that was \$5.7 trillion. During his administration, that has nearly doubled, and will reach \$10.3 trillion by the end of fiscal year 2009.

This administration has presided over a fiscal train wreck, and it is creating obviously a deep hole that we have to climb out of, the American people have to climb out of, and it's a record of rhetoric of rosy fiscal sce-

naros with reckless policies that have caused, in a short time, 7½ years, the greatest explosion in the debt of the United States government, which belongs to you and me and the generations that will come after us, that we are going to have to repay, and it will take generations to do.

I will yield back my time to the gentlelady from Ohio.

Ms. SUTTON. That is an amazing record; not a good one, but it's an amazing record. It's important that we do share this with the American people because we need to know where we stand. What we also know that this isn't the end of the story. We know it doesn't have to be this way. We can make a change. We must make a change.

I know that our next speaker, and we have been joined by Dr. STEVEN KAGEN, the Congressman from Wisconsin. I'd like to throw it over to you. I know you have got some valuable insight to add.

Mr. KAGEN. Thank you very much for yielding. I must say that Mr. WELCH has explained it quite clearly. If I could put it in just different words that I understand. Back home in Wisconsin, we speak a little different that you all do in Vermont.

We would say it this way. President Bush has done all by himself, all by himself, what the Germans and Japanese could not do in World War II. He has destroyed this country and everything, everything that he said he was, he is not. He is the opposite. He is not conservative, he wasn't compassionate. You cannot call it compassionate when the President and the Washington, DC, Republicans produce collateral damage like the family picture I show you here.

Now this could be Kimberly, Wisconsin, it could be West Palm Beach, Florida, it could be Denver, Colorado, it could be anywhere in Ohio, where a family has been dispossessed of their job and their hopes and their dreams. This is a hardworking family. This is the Wendel family. Don and his wife Ann. He worked at a paper mill for 30 years. And because of our trade deals that remain unenforced, unbalanced, and unfair, the Chinese paper that came into our domestic marketplace cut off the business opportunity for the Kimberly mill. I am talking about Kimberly-Clark, where it came from, in Kimberly, Wisconsin.

He lost his job. He lost his hope and his future. And he has to ask this essential question, as do every single voter this fall, every American right now has to ask themselves this question: Whose side are we on?

We are on the side of the Wendel family, whose been dispossessed. This is a picture of the middle class. And this is what I would call collateral damage. We are in an economic battle, an economic war. We have to get our act together, not just here in the House, but in the Senate and in the White House. We have to work together and have

judgment, good judgment lead the way. It was poor judgment, after all, that took us into war, based on lies and deceptions, and it was poor economic decisions by this administration that led to the policy of borrow and spend and borrow and spend. I don't have to remind any of my colleagues what the first two letters are of borrow and spend.

We have got to this point in time. It may be dark. The lights aren't out yet. We have some ideas, we have got the energy, and we are on your side. We are here to help lead us to a brighter future.

I yield back my time.

Ms. SUTTON. I thank the gentleman for his very poignant remarks. There's a question that has to be answered also, and that question is: How many more families? How many more families have to fall out of the middle class, lose their jobs, their hopes, their dreams before we change direction. But the good news is the opportunity for change is on the horizon.

At this point, I'd like to shift it over to my good friend from Florida, a very distinguished Member of this body, a new Member who came in charging, has already started to deliver change, and I know is raring to deliver more in the next administration, Congressman RON KLEIN.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. I'd like to thank the gentlewoman from Ohio and all my colleague here tonight. I'm going to carry this conversation a little further about fiscal discipline because all of us elected last year, Democrats and, interestingly enough, Republicans, have supported fiscal discipline, but got way off track over the last 10 years. It's now the Democrats, many of us, who are sort of leading the fight. We are the fiscal hawks. We are the ones saying this is totally unacceptable for all the reasons you heard tonight.

I think the gentleman from Vermont already mentioned this, but it's worth restating. The Bush administration is responsible for the five biggest deficits, and that total is a staggering amount. But I want to just take that one step further because this is the kind of change that we are going to deliver.

Given the opportunities over the next couple of years, hopefully in a bipartisan way, that is the way we get things done here, but looking at this figure here, this is a chart that says: Taxpayer spending on Iraq war versus Federal spending on other priorities. This is for last year, fiscal year. It has the cost of the Iraq war, \$150 billion.

□ 2045

The cost of NIH funding, that is all the research that government does, all the research on cancer and heart disease and Alzheimer's, all the things that afflict our families and our communities, it is a substantial amount of money. But that figure, plus all the college tuition assistance, everything we do to try to make sure that kids get

into school and get a college education, which we know is so important in the world economy, plus the cost of all the children's health care we provide in the United States, and all the cost of all the bridge repairs and road building and all the things that go on in every single one of our communities, sewers, roads, bridges, all those kinds of things, if you take the cost of roads and bridges, the cost of research, the cost of all the college tuition and the cost of all the health care, that total sum is less than what we spent on the Iraq war.

Now, we debated at length whether the Iraq war is a good war or not or has accomplished a lot. I personally believe, and I serve on the Foreign Affairs Committee, that, unfortunately, the real threat against our national security is in Afghanistan. And it still boggles my mind and most Americans that Osama bin Laden, who committed the worst crime against Americans in our history in the United States, is still free somewhere in the world perpetrating additional threats against the United States through al Qaeda.

The problem, of course, is that he and others most likely are in Afghanistan and Pakistan, the mountain areas there. Unfortunately, we took our eye off the ball. But let's put that issue aside. Hopefully we will be able to deal with that in the near future with the next President.

Let's just talk about, we have spent \$650 billion. I want everybody to remember this number, that is \$339 million we are spending each day on the war in Iraq, \$339 million per day. Let's think about what we could do with that money. I mean, we could have a debate at length here, and I am sure everybody listening tonight on the floor and throughout our country would have lots of good ideas that are legitimate priorities for our country. Yet we are spending that amount of money.

Now, is there an answer that the Democrats have put forward? You bet there is. What was this war sold to us on in terms of how it was going to be paid for? Oil revenues. Iraq sits on the third largest oil revenues and reserves of oil in the world; \$80 billion, it is reported, in banks, some of which is in New York. Eighty billion dollars. That money was supposed to pay for the cost of reconstruction of Iraq, the cost of our military fuel and the cost also of the retraining of the military in Iraq, our military training their military. All legitimate things. Yet what has happened? President Bush has refused, the Republicans have refused to do that.

Now, I introduced a bill, H.R. 1111. H.R. 1111. I said it is number one, put Americans first. I think most Americans would agree with that. Let's take the money that Iraq has, it is \$80 billion, and let them pay for the cost of their reconstruction, the cost of our men and women training their military, and our fuel costs. That is com-

mon sense. That is what we were told in the beginning. They have got the money.

Let's get on with it. That is how we can start putting Americans first and all the priorities that are so important to fixing our economy, getting jobs created, getting an educational system, getting health care put back together, Social Security, Medicare, all the priorities that make America strong on the inside first.

So I think that is a very important point, and we finally got a little bit of discussion on this. But the reality is this is the kind of leadership we are offering and we are providing.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. If the gentleman would yield, I thank my friend from Florida for yielding, because as to the very point you just raised, until March 27, 2003, former Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz said this. You were talking about Iraq paying for its own reconstruction and the costs attendant to this war, which is running us anywhere between \$2.5 and \$3 billion a week, which we could use in any myriad of ways.

He said back on that date, "There is a lot of money to pay for this that doesn't have to be U.S. taxpayer money, and it starts with the assets of the Iraqi people. We are dealing with a country that can really finance its own reconstruction, and relatively soon." And Don Rumsfeld said that "relatively soon" could be 6 days, 6 weeks, he doubted 6 months.

Well, we have been there now more than 5 years, longer than it took for us to win World War II. And what we have, and I would like to point out the chart that is next to me, is we have a problem that has been created by the Bush administration, and Senator MCCAIN would like to perpetuate.

So we have the Bush-McCain policies, the Bush-McCain policies being let's stay in Iraq. They don't have to pay for anything. Senator MCCAIN said it might have to be 100 years. And at the same time, cutting our revenues to this government, so we run up the highest deficits on record. Under Ronald Reagan, under the first George Bush, we had big deficits, a surplus under Bill Clinton and the fiscal policies of the Democrats, and then a gigantic deficit under George Bush II.

What we need, ladies and gentlemen, what I say to my friends, both the Democrats and to the Republicans, is we have to have a change. We cannot have these same old, tired policies. If we have the same old, tired policies with respect to our foreign affairs, such as we are not going to charge the Iraqis for their reconstruction or we are never going to let them take their own destiny into their hands, we are going to have these same old costs and same old losses of life to Americans who have been in Iraq now for more than 5 years.

If we have the same old economic policies, which is what Senator MCCAIN would like to have, it is just more

Bush-McCain policies. We are going to run the deficit to levels we have never seen before, which then have resulted in foreclosures and a whole variety of things, foreclosures, job losses, et cetera.

We have to have a change. That change will come in this election on November 4th. We started this change in 2006 with the election of a Democratic Congress. We have been able to provide minimum wage increases to people. We have changed, for instance, the cost of student loans, so that more people can take advantage of our higher education system. Democrats took on the pharmaceuticals, so that more people can have lower priced pharmaceuticals. We have increased veterans benefits more in the last year than at any other time in the 70-plus year history of the Veterans Administration. This has happened under Democrats.

It is not the same old, failed policies that the Bush administration has had for the last 8 years or that the McCain campaign wants to perpetuate. We need a change, and that change will come with the election of a new President, and that President is going to be Senator BARACK OBAMA, and it is going to continue by the Democrats maintaining a majority in this House. We cannot have more of the same.

There is real opportunity out there for this country. And we heard a little bit today from the Republicans about drill here, drill now. They want to go with the same old, tired energy policy, which just is only oil and gas and just drilling here and drilling now. I don't know exactly what they mean by drill here and drill now.

We had a very interesting story about an ethics scandal within the Interior Department, where some members of the Bush administration's Interior Department, who are supposed to be the watchdogs over the oil and gas companies who are supposed to pay royalties to this country for all of the minerals that they extract from the country. It said, "Investigators from the Interior Department's Inspector General's Office," this is in the Washington Post today, it said, "More than a dozen employees, including the former director of the Oil Royalty Program, accepted gifts, including ski trips, sports tickets and golf outings." The report alleges that the former director netted more than \$30,000.

There was also the fact, they said, "the government officials accepted lavish gifts, steered contracts to favored firms, and engaged in illicit sex with employees of the oil companies, Federal investigators reported today."

So that is the same old thing. We are so hooked on just one commodity, which is oil, which obviously is going to be part of our energy package no matter what. We are going to drill. We are drilling. We are trying to extract this. But we have to have a comprehensive energy plan, which is what the Democrats are proposing and we will propose within the next couple of

weeks, which includes renewable energy, it includes coal, it includes energy efficiency.

Those are the kinds of things that will provide thousands and thousands and thousands of jobs in Colorado and in the manufacturing areas of Ohio. That is the kind of forward looking, innovative approach that we have to take. That is what BARACK OBAMA is going to do. We are not going to have the same old, tired policies exemplified by the Bush administration that JOHN MCCAIN wants to keep going.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. If the gentleman would yield?

Mr. PERLMUTTER. The gentleman would certainly yield to my friend from Connecticut.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. Thank you very much, my friend from Colorado. I am glad you brought up this issue that has come up today. Really you couldn't write this. You couldn't make a movie that was more salacious than the details that are being unveiled today in an article you referenced from the Washington Post regarding not only, it appears, monetary favors, gifts, meals, trips, but sex and drugs. This is a Hollywood blockbuster that is being unveiled here, and it is all on our dime.

What you are saying here is certainly relevant to the question of how we are running our energy policy in this country, that we have an administration that is so cozy to the energy industry that it is not just leases that are being negotiated, but apparently it is drugs and sexual favors being negotiated.

But what we are dealing with really here, Mr. PERLMUTTER, is a government run amuck. This is, I think, symptomatic of a much larger problem. We are talking here about the economic disaster that this administration has wrought, and you can calculate that in so many different ways: wages flat while GDP goes up; deficits running into the trillions of dollars.

But what we also have seen is an administration that just can't run government any longer. They are wasting our taxpayer dollars. Now, they also happen to be wasting all of the money that they are borrowing from foreign banks, but we are wasting a lot of our money too.

It is incredibly relevant that we are here trying to expose the economic disaster that the Bush administration has left us with that we are going to change with the new administration. It is relevant that we are also talking about this new revelation.

You have mentioned some of the details, but what we found in the Interior Department is what investigators call a "culture of substance abuse and promiscuity." Nineteen oil marketers and other employers in the office are accused of having personal and sometimes sexual relationships with representatives of a group of favorite oil and gas companies from 2002 to 2006. Mr. Speaker, this is from the Washington Post story today.

This is what this government has left us with, an economy that is suffering, deficits that are rising, and a government that just doesn't work any longer, whether it is the misuse of our funds in Iraq. We discovered in the Government Oversight Committee that Mr. WELCH and I serve on that \$9 billion was wasted, unaccounted for at the beginning of the war, sometimes thrown out of pickup trucks in duffel bags and never, ever seen again. Or whether it is our response to Katrina and Rita, in which we left thousands, tens of thousands of residents helpless and hopeless. And now today we find that we have unbelievably inappropriate relationships between the government and the oil and gas companies seeking to lease our lands.

This is an economy that is in trouble because of the policies of this administration. This is a government which has simply fallen apart at the seams because of mismanagement. And it all speaks to the change we so desperately need. No more of the same.

JOHN MCCAIN's campaign, as we know, is run by the same crowd of lobbyists who have run the Bush administration for the last 8 years. We need a real change. This Congress with Democrats in charge has started it, but it comes to a completion this November. All of it stops, the mismanagement of this war, the disastrous response to natural disasters and these new revelations about the corruption still endemic in our government.

Ms. SUTTON, it can all change this November.

Ms. SUTTON. I thank the gentleman for his remarks and for his forward looking hopefulness. And I think that you are exactly right. Both of the gentlemen have done a great job in laying out sort of where we are, where we have been and where we can go.

To that end, we do want the American people to take heart. We look at this chart, and this is an important chart to me because it talks about obviously the job growth that occurred under President Bill Clinton, and it also talks about the disastrous job losses that, unfortunately, we have suffered through this administration.

As the gentleman from Connecticut pointed out, we need a government that works. We need a government that works in economic policy and foreign policy and energy policy. We need a government that understands and is responsive to the cries of the people.

□ 2100

We have people who are suffering. We have working families who no longer can put food on the table. We're filling up the food pantry lines. We're having to put more money into our food banks because we need to feed more hungry people. The good news is we're feeding more hungry people. The bad news is there are more hungry people and people in poverty in this country. The good news, though, about this chart is that it can change. It can change. We

saw the job growth explode under the former administration, the Clinton administration. So there is hope for the future.

Part of that, though, is going to revolve around getting a President who understands that the economic policies that we've been operating under need to change. The gentleman from Colorado put it very well when he said we need to get away from the same old, tired policies, the same old, tired path. We have trade policies that are shipping jobs overseas.

We heard the gentleman from Wisconsin talking about the beautiful family that is now in dire straits because of the paper company that has closed, the paper mill. Well, do you know what? The paper mills are starting to close, and they're closing in the wake of the steel mills that have closed, and the steel mills have closed because there were unfair tactics being used by the Chinese, for the most part, in dumping steel into this country, and we couldn't compete because you can't always compete with people who are willing to cheat. It wasn't through any fault of our own or through that of the workers who worked so hard and productively in this country, but it worked so well for those who benefited from it in foreign countries with steel that now they do it with paper. It probably won't end with paper, so we need somebody who understands the need to reform, to make the government work, to make sure that when we have trade policies that they don't work against us. They can work with us and with our workers and with our country and with our industries and with our businesses here.

The good news is there is hope, but it is important that people know where we begin because change is so necessary. The same old, tired policies, they won't take us where we want to go. They'll take us further down the path where we find ourselves today.

Mr. WELCH, do you have anything to add at this point?

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Well, I do have something to add. I just want to go back to the question of Foreign Affairs and the war in Iraq, and I want to do what I did the last time when I was talking about the debt, which is to lay out some of the explicit statements and promises that the administration made about this war and then lay out what the specific results have been. It's important. It's vitally important that the people of this country compare promises to results. This war, in my view, has been a catastrophe, but here is what top officials in the Bush administration said:

"It is unknowable how long that conflict [the war in Iraq] will last. It could last 6 days, 6 weeks, I doubt 6 months," Donald Rumsfeld, February 2003, a month before the war.

"There's a lot of money to pay for this that doesn't have to be U.S. taxpayer money, and it starts with the assets of the Iraqi people. We're dealing

with a country that can really finance its own reconstruction and relatively soon," Paul Wolfowitz, former Deputy Defense Secretary, March of 2003.

Of course, our friend from Florida has outlined the truth that the Iraqi money is in U.S. banks. Treasury money is going over to Iraq to finance things.

"My belief is we will, in fact, be greeted as liberators," Vice President DICK CHENEY. How bright he was, yes. March 16, 2003.

"It's hard to conceive that it would take more forces to provide stability in post-Saddam Iraq than it would to take to conduct the war, itself, and to secure the surrender of Saddam's security forces and his army. Hard to imagine," Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz.

"I don't know where bin Laden is. I have no idea and really don't care. It's not that important. It's not our priority," President George Bush, Commander in Chief, March 2002.

"If we're an arrogant Nation, they'll resent us. If we're a humble Nation but strong, they'll welcome us [in Iraq]," George Bush.

We know the facts. The war in Iraq has now lasted longer than the U.S. involvement in World War II. Four thousand one hundred fifty-five Americans have been killed in Iraq, and more than 30,000 troops have been wounded as of September 7 of this year. No weapons of mass destruction were ever found. That was the whole pretext that George Bush used to justify this war.

More than \$600 billion has been spent, none of it on the books incidentally, all on the credit card. Some projections estimate that the war, when all of the expenses are paid, including what we have to pay to provide health care to our seriously injured soldiers, will exceed \$3 trillion.

The Iraqi Government has now forced the Bush administration to accept something that many of us have been arguing for four years, a timetable. It took the President of Iraq to force the President of the United States to get real and to understand that what we can expect of the American taxpayer and what we can expect of the American soldier has its limits and that it's time to start asking the Iraqis to step up and to take on the burden of their own future.

America's military is stretched thin. There is just no dispute about this. It weakens our ability to respond to other threats. The chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Michael Mullen, has stressed that the need for more troops in Afghanistan is great, but due to the war in Iraq, they're not available. The Bush administration has grossly neglected Afghanistan and has failed to acknowledge that that is a major threat.

These are promises, the cavalier disregard for the hidden consequences, the consequences beyond your control when you embark on a war, on a thoughtless war, and disregard the

need to build up alliances like George Bush's father did in the first Gulf war, and you cavalierly go off with promises, reckless promises, irresponsible promises by people in positions of great trust. The greatest trust that they have is that they have a duty to use due deliberation in the protection of the lives of the American people and of the American soldiers. They have to use due deliberation, careful thought, responsible analysis in committing American power abroad and in committing the lives of our soldiers abroad. They cavalierly made predictions. Vice President CHENEY will go down in history as just having been totally out of touch.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Would the gentleman from Vermont just yield for 30 seconds?

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I will yield, yes.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. In your litany of things where they made promises, made promises, made promises, none of them turned out to be accurate or true.

One of them that just still boggles my mind is, just a few weeks after the invasion into Iraq, George Bush was on that aircraft carrier, saying, "Mission accomplished." JOHN MCCAIN was saying, "Mission accomplished." All of these guys were saying, "Mission accomplished." We are now 5-years plus since that time.

Now, our men and our women have been doing an unbelievable job. Initially, their equipment was not proper. Their vehicles weren't built in a way that was safe. We've changed that. We've helped them because they've done a job that has been above and beyond the call of duty, but it's the Commander in Chief and the judgment of the Commander in Chief who is in place today that we have to question, his judgment and the judgment of whom we want to be Commander in Chief.

Who has the right judgment? Who can really take our reputation from what's now down in the gutter internationally and raise it back up? Who has the judgment to get this country working again? Who has the judgment and the energy and the ability to renew the strength of this country, to call on all of us to make the sacrifices and to meet the challenges that we've got ahead of us that we know will lead us back to the great Nation that we are and to the great people that we are?

It's not the same old administration. It's not the same old people. It's not the Karl Roves of the world. We're going to have to finish this change because we can do much better than we've done.

So, with that, I'll yield to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. KAGEN. Thank you, Mr. PERLMUTTER. I couldn't agree with you more. It really begs the question about not just whose side we're on, but what are the lessons that we've been learning.

I have not been in politics. I was in student council in 1966, and now I'm in

Congress. I was a physician. Still am. I had a nice medical practice, but I got involved in this line of work because we were headed in that wrong direction we've been describing. We have taken since 2007 in January a positive change. We've been making incremental, small, little changes. It is so frustrating having come from the world of business to the world of government where changes are so slow, but it's so necessary. One would think that the President took office to prove what government could not do, and it's really incumbent upon us to prove that good government could really make a positive difference in everybody's lives.

The two lessons I've learned since getting into this world of politics is that people will believe a lie if it's presented with great skill on television. People will believe a lie if it's presented over and over with great skill. The other lie is that—well, it's not really a lie. It's a lesson. Politicians will determine who lives and who dies. It's politicians here in this Chamber. It's politicians in the White House who will determine who has access to health care and who does not, who will determine who gets a great education and who does not, who will determine whether or not we truly become an energy independent Nation or if we do not or who will determine if we ever go to war again based on lies and deceptions.

That is why I emphasize the fact that we need in the White House today people with good judgment, people who can think things all the way through, someone who will sign a bill to guarantee access to 11 million children who are in need, someone who will sign that bill, not veto that bill. I'm referring to the change, to the positive change, that we really need.

When you talk, Mr. WELCH, about the war in Iraq, does anyone question that that war was a war of choice, not of necessity? Does anyone believe that it had not something to do with oil? Has the price of oil gone down since we've occupied and have invaded Iraq? Not at all. Quite the contrary.

So what we have to do in this Chamber is to begin to find a way forward to become fiscally responsible and to stay true to our beliefs that we are also progressive-minded and that we really do care about the middle class. We need to resuscitate that middle class as soon as possible. In the next several days, that is why we are going to take up an energy independence bill, a comprehensive national strategy to become energy independent once again. That's what this Chamber has the responsibility of doing in a bipartisan way, and I look forward to doing that in the next several days.

Thank you, Mr. WELCH, for bringing up the subject of war.

Again, as Mr. PERLMUTTER pointed out, it is our soldiers, the men and women who have volunteered to serve in our Armed Services, who are paying the price for our continued and seemingly endless occupation in Iraq. Those

are the soldiers who have covered our backs in battle, and we owe it to them to cover their backs when they return.

I yield to Mr. KLEIN from Florida.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Thank you to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Just to pick up on your point on our men and women serving and our veterans, I'm from Florida. Every one of us in our districts has a huge number of veterans—some from World War II, some from the Korean war, some from Vietnam. Many of our Vietnam veterans today are hurting. Whether it's Agent Orange or just age, itself, it has really begun to impact them. Now we're creating a new generation of an upwards of 2 million new veterans. We don't want to create that next generation of homeless. We know there are huge post-traumatic stress issues associated with it, but I'm particularly proud in working with our local veterans' organizations and national veterans' organizations which gave our leaders the recommendations of what they need in order to eliminate the backlog, to make sure that the care was in place for evaluations of post-traumatic stress or to recognize that, of the many men and women coming home today, back in the Vietnam war, they wouldn't have lived with their damage and with their injuries. That's right. Today, they're coming home, and we have a responsibility. I say this and people understand. Americans understand. We stand up for our men and women who put the uniform on. That's something we feel very strongly about, but we have to recognize that we will have to provide for them for the rest of their lives and that we will have to support their families as well. That new GI Bill is key. It was the right thing to do. For many of the people who don't even know this, it even allows the balance of those benefits to go to the spouse and to the children. Isn't that the right thing to do for the families?

Mr. KAGEN. Yes.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. I mean that's the "thank you" that Americans want to give the men and women who serve us, but when we are asked to serve in our military, we need to make sure it is the right place and the right time and for our national security interests, which is, unfortunately, what went wrong.

The gentlewoman from Ohio, you have led the fight in this Congress on jobs. I'm from Ohio originally. You and I talk about that. I grew up in Cleveland. Now, as a Floridian, I know we have a different set of economic issues in Florida, but they're very similar in terms of jobs being lost overseas. I want to point this board out real fast here because it talks about jobs created through August in President Clinton's years.

There were 1.47 million jobs created under President Clinton. In President Bush's 8 years—

Mr. KAGEN. In 8 months.

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Excuse me. In 8 months. Thank you. In these last 8

months, 605,000 jobs were lost under this administration. You'll hear in the Presidential election on the Republican side the same thing again and again and again, the same economic plan. It's an old plan. It's not getting us anywhere.

I just want to point this out because we can do better. It's one of those areas again. This Congress has already done a number of things, I think, that are very positive. We've passed the biggest increase in the Pell Grants in years. For those who aren't familiar with Pell Grants, it's those scholarships for great students to get into college. The kids in our communities want to get those great college educations. There are Pell Grants and other types of financial incentives for kids to get into schools.

We recognize foreclosures are a big problem in many of our communities. My district in Fort Lauderdale has a huge number of foreclosures. It's not just the individual person who is foreclosed on; it's the neighbors who are impacted, and it's the depression on the value of homes, and it's the communities that are impacted and all of the things that go with it.

□ 2115

And we passed something that the Congresses in the past should have done in the last few years to prevent this from ever happening in the first place. We actually did some things now to help get people back on their feet and fix that.

But look what happened last week again. Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, another multi billion dollar bailout. And why are they doing this? Well, they have to do it is what we're told.

But the bottom line is again, a legacy of very, very bad economic planning, very bad policies that this administration and previous Congresses were not able to do anything or had no will to do anything about.

The bottom line is, though, we are a resilient people as Americans. We have a resilient economy, and we will get beyond there.

So I'm all for the education part; I'm all for the job training part, our community colleges, our universities, our scholarships, the job training, the skill sets to get everybody back to work and the recognition that if we are going to do some economic stimulus thing, let's get our infrastructure, let's go out there in the community.

Mr. KAGEN. Would the gentleman yield? Thank you for yielding.

On that front, the single greatest fiscal economic challenge we are going to be facing is a health care crisis. It is the number one fiscal challenge for our budget in the Federal Government. It's also the major challenge of every business, be it small or large business. It also challenges city governments, whether it's a town or a county government and every family across America. And that is why I believe we have to begin to have a discussion about mak-

ing a marriage between our Constitution and health care.

Now, if you read the Constitution, as I have, it doesn't say anywhere in here that we have a constitutional right to health care. But we do have a right that protects us against discrimination. We have to apply that right that guarantees us protection from discrimination to health care, to the health care industry, so that all insurance companies will lose their opportunity to discriminate against you on the basis of a pre-existing condition. If we don't stand up for our rights, we're going to lose them, every single one of them, every single one of them.

So I look forward in this session and the next, working with a President who understands that discrimination is taking place today in the health care industry. We must end discrimination and put it where it belongs, into our past.

Mr. PERLMUTTER.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I thank my friend from Wisconsin. I'm going to take a step back from the health care, talk about the GSEs, the Government Sponsored Entities, the Federal National Mortgage Association and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, which were, in effect, taken over, placed into conservatorship.

And sometimes I charge my friends on the Republican side of the aisle with not doing what needed to be done. But in this instance they did, back in 2005, pass legislation that would have prevented, or at least somehow dealt with these GSE problems, this takeover that we had to have in the last few days.

And it was Mr. Oxley who was the chairman of the committee at the time. There was a piece of legislation passed. He was an Ohio Republican who headed the House Financial Services, this is from the Financial Times of yesterday, until his retirement at the mid term elections last year. Blames the mess, meaning the takeover of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, on ideologues within the White House, as well as Alan Greenspan, former chairman of the Federal Reserve. He says, he fumes about the criticism of his House colleagues. All the hand wringing and bed wetting is going on without remembering how the House stepped up on this. He continues, "What did we get from the White House? We got a one-finger salute."

He finishes, "We missed a golden opportunity, we, being the United States of America missed a golden opportunity that would have avoided a lot of problems we're facing now if we hadn't had such a firm ideological position at the White House and the Treasury and the FED."

We now have had to take over these entities that have supplied money to help us all buy houses for decades and decades and decades, and it's as a result of a White House that didn't believe in any kind of regulation. We talked about it just a few minutes ago, with these guys over at the Minerals



Management Service and the frat house that they ran where they were getting gifts and they were getting sexual favors and all of that kind of stuff.

This administration could have cared less about regulation, and this country has been damaged because of it. We can't have these same old policies anymore, ladies and gentlemen. We can't afford it. This country can't afford it. We're too great a Nation. We're too great a people. Our neighbors, our friends, our families sacrifice too much to have this kind of approach by people, whether it's not regulating big government entities or sleeping with the people you're supposed to regulate. We can't have that anymore. We can't have more of the same.

We need a change. We need a new direction. That new direction is going to be BARACK OBAMA, it's going to be the Democrats. We've got to finish the change that was begun in 2006 with the election of a new White House with new policies that are going to renew this Nation. And we can do that. And I know that, by all of us working together, there really is hope for this Nation, and we're going to take the action that brings about jobs and health care and, really, a return to what we know is great about this Nation.

Mr. KAGEN. Together we will.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. And so I'd like to turn it back to the President of our class, the Honorable BETTY SUTTON from Ohio.

Ms. SUTTON. I thank the gentleman from Colorado, and you put it so well. You put it so well. Our country deserves better, and we need to deliver better with a new president. And BARACK OBAMA has the potential to make that happen, and we are ready, and we want to work in a bipartisan way to help him get us where we need to go, where we know we can go on all of these issues with the economy, with health care.

Health care has been a tragedy. The President, the Bush administration started out, the President saying America's children must also have a healthy start in life. And a new term will lead an aggressive effort to enroll millions of poor children who are eligible but not signed up for government health insurance programs. He said that in September of 2004.

But nearly 1 in 9 children does not have health insurance. And the President vetoed the expansion of SCHIP that he called for in 2004. And House Republicans voted to sustain that veto, leaving millions of children without health insurance.

We also know that health premiums have increased 78 percent since the administration took office. And the number of Americans covered by private employer-provided insurance has decreased 7 years in a row. It is a competitiveness issue as well for our businesses. Our employers cannot bear this burden and compete effectively. This is a national emergency.

But again, the good news is that if we deviate away from the path that has

been trod by this administration, the Bush and McCain policies of the past, we can do right by our Nation's children for health care. We can do right by the people out there who are fighting for jobs, who are fighting for access to that which they need for their families, who are just fighting to keep a roof over their heads. And these people are doing things right. They're doing everything right. And yet, this is a country, when you do things right, you ought to be able to make it. And we can do that again. And we can, working with BARACK OBAMA in the White House, it will make all the difference in the world.

Mr. KLEIN, would you like to share with us your thoughts and perhaps wrap up here a little bit?

Mr. KLEIN of Florida. Well, I think it's really been an honor and privilege to be with my colleagues tonight. It's been an honor and privilege to serve as the freshman class, as Democrats and serving with our Republican colleagues as well. This is a great institution. Our country is a great country.

We've pointed out, as you said from the very beginning, where we're starting from. That's the reality. I mean, as decisionmakers, if you're in business or you run your household, you always have to know where you start from in order to make good decisions going forward.

And unfortunately, our next President and this next Congress and our country is going to be saddled for a little while with debt. And that's something we can start to dig our way out. And one thing that we did in this Congress, Democrats leading the charge here on our fiscal conservative policies is PAYGO. And that's a principle that everybody operates. You may not know what that means. PAYGO, pay as you go. It's the most simple principle. If you have a checkbook, you can't spend more money than what's in your checkbook. Or if you have a credit card, you can't spend more money than you can afford to pay back every month.

Well, why should Congress, in the last 6 years under the administration, operate under this principle of because we can print money, they just keep printing?

Well, fortunately last year a new principle is involved here. And now, when we pass a bill, unless it's an emergency, we have to make sure the money is in the budget. No, based on speculation that in the next number of months we're going to have all this new revenue in here. Things have slowed down a little bit, so we have to be realistic. That's exactly what the American people expect, and that's the kind of leadership we're delivering.

So I am pretty excited about the fiscal policies under this Congress, and we're beginning to get them where they should be. A new president with new policies, not tied to the old policies as we've been talking tonight will deliver on that on our health care, on

Social Security, on Medicare, veterans' benefits will continue to be the highest priority and understanding that comes first.

Getting our foreign policy, which I serve on the committee, and many of you do, getting that re-established in a way that we earn the respect and work well with our partners around the world to really make sure that our national security is protected. And most importantly, get our economy, our American families in Ohio, in West Virginia and Wisconsin and Florida, in Seattle, everywhere, all over the country, that we will get them back in shape and give those Americans the opportunities that they've always had. And every generation, that principle of every generation having it a little better than the last generation. It's what my parents fought for. It's what my grandparents fought for and it's what we fight for our children.

So I thank our President, Madam BETTY SUTTON from Ohio, PETER WELCH from Vermont, Mr. PERLMUTTER from the great State of Colorado, Dr. KAGEN from Wisconsin, Mr. MURPHY from Connecticut. It's just a small representation of a great group of people that really are working very hard to do the right thing by Americans and get our country back on track.

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Ms. SUTTON. I think that was a great wrap up. I'd like to just, if I could, point it back over to Representative KAGEN from Wisconsin, because I think, again, what we're talking about here are the faces in that picture and the opportunity and the potential that we know that this country is full of and we have to help unleash so it works for the people in that photograph and people all across this country, and certainly the people in Ohio's 13 District.

Dr. KAGEN.

Mr. KAGEN. You're looking at the face of America, from the middle part of the country in Northeast Wisconsin, and they may have lost their job, but they will not give up their hope.

We're all working hard here to bring about the changes, we need like knocking down the price for energy and gas and heating fuel, like bringing on the higher-wage jobs that we need just to put a roof over our head and guarantee that our children have an opportunity to get the great education that they require.

And most importantly to me, as a physician and a legislator, we're going to provide access to affordable care for every citizen everywhere in these United States. The face of America, keep hope high. We're here to help you.

Ms. SUTTON. I yield back.

#### THE TRUTH SQUAD

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNERNEY). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms.



Foxx) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, there's so much that needs to be said tonight and 1 hour's just not enough time to do it. I think I want to recommend that people read, again, if you haven't read, the book, 1984, because what you've seen exhibited here tonight is a living example of that book, where people distort the facts, they distort the past, and certainly distort the facts.

I do have to say a couple of things. We're here tonight to talk about energy and the failed energy policies of the Democratically controlled Congress. The Democrats are in control of the Congress, and they have been since January 2007. And I think it's very, very important that we continue to remind the American people of that.

For one thing, my colleagues talked about the 605,000 jobs lost in the last 8 months. Well, I'm here to say that's because the Democrats are in charge of Congress. They want to blame it on the President. The President can't make anything happen about those jobs that are lost. Congress can. And the American people have to hold the Democrats in charge of the Congress accountable.

□ 2130

I do want to get on to energy, but I have to make, again, a couple of comments about what was said here tonight.

We had a "Truth Squad" that used to meet on a regular basis here to correct the misstatements made by our colleagues almost every night, not every night. But I want to bring this Truth Squad back in the form of just me tonight by talking about some of the things, again, that they have said.

I really was a little surprised that they focused so much on the war. I think it's really emblematic, again, of their running away from the issue that's most important to the American people, and that is the high price of gasoline and the high price of fuel oil. And they made lots of promises tonight, just like the Democrats did in 2006 when they were running for election and asked the American people to give them the majority. Well, the American people did give them the majority, and every promise they made has been broken. They promised to bring down the price of gasoline. They promised to make this the most open Congress ever, the most bipartisan Congress. Every one of those promises was broken.

What we need to be focusing on, and what Republicans have been focusing on for the 20 months that the Democrats have been in control of the Congress, has been the high price of energy and how that price has been going steadily up. And again, I was a little bit amazed tonight that the focus of the group just before me was on the war and on the economy and blaming all of that on somebody else.

They talked about how jobs had increased under the Clinton administra-

tion. Let me remind the American people that President Clinton had a Democratic Congress for the first 2 years of his administration, and those 2 years were not good for this economy. In fact, they were pretty rotten, 1992 and 1993. The Republicans took control of the House in 1994, in the fall of 1994, and came into office in 1995. Certainly we had a good economy under President Clinton, but it was because the Republicans were in charge of the Congress.

The Democrats conveniently leave that little fact out. They give all the credit to President Clinton. It wasn't President Clinton's policies that gave us a great economy. It was the Republican Congress.

They talk about the problems with Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac and the failed administration. I think we will see more and more coming out that the problems with Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac are because of the liberal policies of the Democrats forcing banks, mortgage companies, loan companies to make loans to people who should never have gotten loans. I'm sure there's some greed out there, and I'm sure that there are some characters that we wouldn't like being in the business. But most of it was because of the liberal policies that they put into effect years ago.

I do want to say that I appreciate what we have done for our veterans in this session of Congress, but the folks who spoke before us said they thanked the men and women who served us, and I do, too. We're going to be celebrating 9/11 tomorrow, 2001. We'll not celebrate but commemorate what happened that day. And I want to say I'm so grateful to the men and women who are currently serving in our military because they are all volunteers.

These folks say they think they've been serving in the wrong places, they've been put in the wrong places. Well, I thank the good Lord many times every day that we have men and women who are willing to serve this country no matter where it is they have to serve because they believe in this country and they will go wherever it is necessary for them to serve.

Now again, I want to talk more about energy now because that is what I think has created so many of the problems that we're facing.

My colleagues and I were here all during the month of August while the Democrats went on vacation. They took a 5-week vacation. And in fact, they're still on vacation because this week, we're doing practically nothing here in the Congress. We have passed bills like commemorating the Kingdom of Bhutan's participation in the 2008 Smithsonian Folk Life Festival, really important things to be doing while we should be voting on the American Energy Act, the bill that would create all-of-the-above alternatives for us.

And I want to recognize now my colleague from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA) who has served his State and this coun-

try so well as a member of the Intelligence Committee, Ranking Member of the Intelligence Committee and formally chairman of the Intelligence Committee, to allow him to offer some comments on the energy issue and to bring his perspective to this.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I thank my colleague for yielding. And as we go through the next period of time, we may have the opportunity to have more of a dialogue to talk a little bit about the energy issue and the challenges that we are facing as a Nation.

Of course you and I remember that early in August when Congress recessed, we were on this floor that Friday where a number of us had signed up for the opportunity to address our colleagues but most importantly to address the American people on the issue of energy. And we can sign up for 5 minutes, but our colleagues on the other side of the aisle said, "No, we're going home," and they shut down debate.

We came to the floor. We continued talking on the floor as they turned down the lights, as they turned off C-SPAN as they attempted to lock the press from covering the issues as to exactly what was happening here on the floor of the House.

We continued that process for the next 5 weeks until Congress belatedly came back into session this past Monday. And as my colleague has indicated, we came back into session, and we've done no meaningful legislation. We haven't dealt with the issue of the threats of radical jihadists. We haven't dealt with health care, we haven't dealt with energy. Prices back in my district have again spiked up this week even though the price of oil has come down about 30 percent of its high of \$147. You know, prices at the pump spiked back up this week.

And for some people, the issue of energy is an inconvenience. Paying a little bit more or paying a lot more at the pump is an inconvenience to some people. But I can tell you in July, I spent a part of a morning at the gas station pumping gas. People would come in; I would help fill up their cars. They would fill out a survey for me. I would spend some time talking to them. And for a number of these people, filling up their tank is now a hardship.

And I think you and I would agree that we wish they had a proposal on the other side of the aisle. We wish that they would bring energy to the floor of the House for us to debate because this problem is only going to get worse.

I live in a northern State. Today my constituents are challenged with the price of filling up their gas tank, because I went through the district during August. I found people who drove as much as 40, 50, 60 miles one way to work. So they're putting on 80 to 100, 120 miles a day. Filling up their gas tank is a hardship.

In those same areas, when we get to November, December, January, they're

also going to get hit with home heating costs. A double whammy. They're going to fill up their pump or their car at the pump, and then they are going to have to go home and pay the heating bills for their house. And these folks are unwilling to build a plan to address that right here on the floor of the House.

Now, they went into a caucus today, and we see how they're writing their legislation. It's kind of like we're going to get a plan that can get 218 Democratic votes. They're not going to introduce a bill. They're not doing to take it to a subcommittee, have hearings on it, have people come in and say, you know, here is what we really like about your bill and what we think really works, and we think this may be a weakness. People proposing amendments, they vote on amendments, the bill gets better, it goes to full committee, you go through the same process, and it comes to the floor of the House where again, people like you and I who might not be on a committee of jurisdiction, if we've got a good idea or something that we think is a good idea, we have the opportunity to present it to our colleagues and have it voted on to see if it can be part of this final package. That's not the process they're going to use.

They're writing a bill in secret, and we have no idea what it is. And I would guess, you know, we thought maybe it would come out Friday. They're not going to hit that deadline. They're maybe coming out with a bill Monday or Tuesday. It will probably be a thousand pages, and they will say, Congresswoman, here it is. Here is our energy plan. Congressman, here it is. We will say, What is it? They will say, Read it. And it's like, whoa.

And we already know what it's going to be. We're for all-of-the-above: Exploration, drilling for American oil, natural gas, we're for conservation, we're for higher fuel efficiency standards and automobiles and those types of things. We're for alternative technology and investing in wind, solar, geothermal, and all of those types of things recognizing that to fix the problem on energy, we need an all-of-the-above solution because nuclear alone won't fix it, drilling alone won't fix it. T. Boone Pickens is right. We can't drill our way out of this problem. But we can help.

Right now one final comment, and then we can talk about this.

Sitting on the Intelligence Committee we know where we're getting the oil from. We get a lot from Canada, a lot from Mexico. These are two reliable allies, although there is some instability from Mexico. After that, the neighborhood gets to be pretty ugly.

Nigeria. Nigeria is a great country, but it has a tremendous amount of instability and corruption.

You then go to the Middle East. A lot of these folks are not our friends.

You then go to Russia. Ask the Georgians. Is Russia a reliable ally? Ask the people in Ukraine. Is Russia a reliable

ally? Russia has started this. Russia, a couple of years ago, was the country that said, or through their policies, indicated that they were willing to use energy as a political tool by threatening to cut off natural gas to places like the Ukraine. And in many ways we're funding our enemies.

Bottom line on this. This year we will run about a \$600 to \$700 billion trade deficit. If we became energy independent, our trade deficit would approach zero. Trade deficit isn't manufacturing. It's none of these things. It's energy. And if we invest in that, we could move forward.

Ms. FOXX. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I will yield.

We're joined by a few of our friends, and I think we can have a spirited discussion about the future of America rather than focusing on the past. So thank you for yielding.

Ms. FOXX. I agree with you.

Do you remember some of the promises that were made by the then minority?

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If the gentlelady will yield, I think the big promise was—I have Speaker PELOSI saying, I have a secret plan.

I'm not sure that she said "secret."

Ms. FOXX. I think she said, "I have a commonsense plan."

Mr. HOEKSTRA. "I have a commonsense plan to lower the price of gasoline." Whoa.

You know, I hope that she let's America know soon what it is because for the last 20 months under Speaker PELOSI, her commonsense plan has only meant pain and hardship for my constituents.

Ms. FOXX. And I think that what we need to do is take some of the promises that were spewed out here tonight by these folks who had the hour before us and put them next to all of those promises that were made by Speaker PELOSI and majority leader HOYER in 2006 and say, well, if they delivered on these promises in 2006, then maybe we could believe they will deliver on these promises in the next election.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. If the gentlelady will yield for a minute.

I thought it was pretty interesting on the floor when the minority leader on the floor, Mr. BOEHNER from Ohio, was talking about a procedural vote here on the floor and said, "Will you allow a vote on the American Energy Independence Bill?" And the answer after he asked that question three or four times, the folks on that side of the aisle started saying, "No, no, no," meaning they don't want to have a full and complete debate on energy.

What really makes me concerned is that they're going to throw up—we know what they're going to—we're for all-of-the-above. They're going to come out with a plan later on, who knows. I wouldn't even call it a plan. They will come out with a piece of paper, and as we dissect it, it will be none-of-the-above. They're not for nuclear, they're

not for drilling offshore, they're not for drilling in Alaska.

□ 2145

Ms. FOXX. They're not for nuclear.

Mr. SHIMKUS. So you go through all of this and say it's not even some of the above. They'll put in, especially when it comes to drilling, and they'll say well you can drill in these specific areas.

But as one of my colleagues, Congressman SHADEGG, has pointed out, I think in Alaska and some other areas, where 487 leases were issued, every single one of those leases has been challenged multiple times through the process by radical environmental groups to make sure that no drilling takes place. Those folks know that we can open this up, but because we've created these environmental standards, the radical environmental standard, no drilling will ever take place.

Ms. FOXX. I think that, even though we haven't seen the bill, I feel certain that I will be able to give that bill the Emperor's New Clothes Award because it will pretend to do something but it will do nothing. So I can just about bet that it's going to do nothing and will deserve the Emperor's New Clothes Award. I have the Emperor's New Clothes Award here. You can see it on the podium here, and so I'm going to give it the Emperor's New Clothes Award. I know that's what it's going to deserve.

Mr. SHIMKUS. I think as we talk about this, and I hope our colleagues join in. I come from the great State of Michigan and we're struggling. Last month, we were at 8.5 percent unemployment. My expectation is that now with what's happened at the national level that unemployment rate is going to go up.

But as we struggle with these energy costs, it has absolutely hammered jobs. It has absolutely hammered the automotive industry and these types of things, and the refusal of our colleagues to deal with this issue means increased unemployment and increased hardship for a State like Michigan.

And you know, our Governor came out recently and said I can't believe that Michigan may be in play in this election, and it's kind of like, excuse me, Republicans are going to do very well in the State of Michigan because Democrats in Washington have refused to deal with the issue of energy. And if people want to take a look at what America might look like under a Democrat administration all the way through, take a look at Michigan.

Michigan, our Governor came up with a brilliant strategy of saying, you know, we've got the highest unemployment rate in the country. You know what we ought to do? To attract more business, to attract more investment to the State of Michigan, let's raise taxes and let's make sure people don't understand exactly how much or where those taxes are going to be raised because we think that will get people to

come to our State and get them to invest and create jobs.

Now, we live on a peninsula. People don't come to Michigan naturally. If they want to do and invest in Michigan, they've got to be going down the expressway in Indiana, and depending on whether they're going east or west, they've got to make a left turn or a right turn. And I'll tell you, they're not turning into Michigan anymore because they're looking at Ohio, Illinois, Indiana and all of these States, and they're saying these are pretty good States to do business in. And if we take a left turn and go up into Michigan, we're going to be paying more in taxes. We will just kind of stay on the interstate and do business here.

But that's what, you know, we're facing with a Democrat leadership that not only won't deal with the energy issue, but will raise taxes because they believe the best way for America to be competitive on a global basis is not to grow American industries but to tax American industries and to tax the American citizen so that we can feed this beast in Washington.

Ms. FOXX. Thank you. I appreciate my colleague from Michigan explaining the Michigan situation. I want to make just one comment, and I'm going to ask some of my other colleagues to speak.

When the Democrats took over the Congress in 2007, January 2007, we had had 54 straight months of job growth under a Republican-led Congress and a Republican administration. What they refuse to admit is, as soon as they took over the Congress, the price of gasoline started going up, and as the price of gasoline started going up, so did the unemployment rate. There is no denying these facts. They caused this problem. We've been pointing this out week after week. We're finally, we think, getting through that the Democrats are in charge of the Congress, and it is their policies that have created these problems.

I want to recognize now my colleague from Pennsylvania I think who has some comments to make about this situation, and we've been suddenly joined by several people. And so I do hope that we'll have a great dialogue here, but with my classmate, my colleague from Pennsylvania, I yield to you.

Mr. DENT. I'd like to thank the gentlelady from North Carolina for her leadership on this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, I feel it's very important that as with Members of Congress we lead, and there are a lot of things that the Congress would like to do, need to do, but there's one thing that we must do, and that is fund the Federal Government. I think it is a dereliction of duty on the part of this Speaker of the House and this Congress that this Congress has failed, has failed to deal with the various spending bills, the appropriations bills to fund the government.

The reason why this Congress is not dealing with these appropriations bills

is because there is fear, fear that some Member of the House, some impermanent Member, maybe a Republican Member, maybe a Democratic Member, will stand up on this floor and offer an amendment to provide for additional American energy production from traditional sources.

So we're not dealing with the most important business of Congress, which is to fund the government because there is fear to deal with the energy issue, and I think it is unrealistic and unfair that there are people in this House who, for whatever reasons, oppose traditional sources of energy. Everybody here supports alternative renewable fuels, but we also know we need to deal with the here and the now.

I come from a State, Pennsylvania, where we are rich in coal resources, where oil was discovered in Titusville, Pennsylvania, by Colonel Drake some time ago. We have tremendous natural gas reserves. My State has been part of the energy solution for this Nation for a very long time and will continue to be.

Ms. FOXX. I heard that the United States is the Saudi Arabia of coal and that we have three times the coal reserves that Saudi Arabia has in oil reserves. Have you heard the same thing?

Mr. DENT. I've heard the same thing, and I believe that reference is to some of the vast oil shale reserves out in the Rocky Mountain West. But I know in terms of coal, it's estimated that we have about 250 years' worth of coal supply, assuming we're consuming at the current levels.

What I did want to say, though, is coal is responsible for 50 percent of the electricity generated in the United States. Nuclear energy is responsible for about 20 percent. Natural gas for another 20 percent. I'm up to 90 percent. There's a little bit of other. Petroleum, hydroelectric takes a fair amount. Solar and wind I think account for about 1 percent.

But unfortunately, while I strongly support solar, wind, geothermal and other renewables, I also know there are too many people in this Congress that, though renewables account for 1 percent of our source, it accounts for 100 percent of their talking points.

The truth is we know we're going to need coal. We need to clean it up. Clean coal technology, there's a lot of interesting, carbon capture, storage sequestration going on out there. We need to develop that technology. I think we all understand, too, that if we want to lower carbon emissions in America we're going to need to expand nuclear energy.

But again, many people in this building are opposed to coal technology. They're opposed to nuclear. They're opposed to drilling for gas and oil where those resources may actually be. So that really limits our options as a Nation.

We have to get to work. Everybody knows it. And this is not a Republican issue or a Democratic issue. This is an

American issue. The American people are pragmatic. They want us to solve the problem.

I'll be the first to tell you, you know, our critics, the critics of the Republican Party will say that Republicans are too focused on production and supply. Critics of the Democrats will say that they're too focused on conservation and efficiency. The truth is we must do both, and I'll be the first to tell you that we can't drill our way out of this problem, but drilling is most assuredly part of the solution, just as conservation is part of the solution, and neither can you conserve your way out of the problem.

So we need people to be pragmatic, come down here and support something reasonable. The American Energy Act about which we've been speaking tonight is a good piece of legislation. It deals with all of the above, the alternatives, renewables, transitions to the future, as well as traditional sources of energy, conservation, efficiency.

There's another bill out there, the Peterson-Abercrombie bill, which is a genuine bipartisan bill that there's a lot in there I like and there's some things I'm not particularly crazy about, but I would support that bill. I'm a cosponsor of it. In the name of compromise, I'm willing to support legislation that will advance this discussion and actually, more importantly, advance America's energy security.

At the end of the day, the American people want us to become less dependent on unstable parts of the world for fossil fuel. I think you and I agree to that, but it's going to require leaders to say, yes, take an affirmative approach to energy. But as you know, too many people here are not willing to do that, and I have to lay the blame at the doorstep of the Speaker of the House.

I thank Ms. FOXX, my classmate, for allowing me to speak on this important issue.

Ms. FOXX. I want to thank my classmate, Congressman DENT from Pennsylvania, for illuminating this issue from his perspective in Pennsylvania.

Now I want to turn it over to a new Member of Congress this year who's been, I think, one of the really bright lights in the Congress, who's one of the most articulate people that we have in the Congress, Congresswoman MICHELLE BACHMANN from the Minneapolis/St. Paul area, which just hosted many of us who were at the Republican National Convention.

And I want to say that it was certainly "Minnesota Nice." The folks in Minnesota were fabulous. They treated us very well, very friendly, just like the people in North Carolina. I was extremely pleased to be there, and I want to ask you if you will share some of your perspectives on this issue of energy.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Thank you, Ms. FOXX. I appreciate that.

Minneapolis/St. Paul is a very nice area. Minnesota is the "Land of Minnesota Nice," and we really do love

people. So y'all come back, if we can borrow that from you. Y'all come back.

My name is MICHELLE BACHMANN. I do represent Minnesota's Sixth Congressional District, and I tell you what I am so pleased about is the fact that the United States, we have the answer to our energy problem.

We have, as Representative DENT of Pennsylvania said, we have an abundance of coal. We're the leader in the world. Twenty-seven percent of the world's supply of coal lies here in the United States of America.

We're the Saudi Arabia of oil in three States alone: Utah, Colorado, Wisconsin. We have more oil than all of Saudi Arabia contained in shale oil.

We have an abundance of natural gas. We have over 420 trillion cubic square feet of natural gas, and that's just in the Gulf of Mexico.

We have so much oil and we haven't even begun to tap what we have in terms of nuclear power, what we can do with wind, what we can do with solar, with all of the inventions that are yet to come out of brilliant young entrepreneurs. All we need to do is unleash it.

But right now, you're looking, Mr. Speaker, at the problem for this, for the energy crisis. It isn't lack of resources. It certainly isn't lack of technology. What it is is lack of will on the part of the United States Congress. Mr. Speaker, the Democrat-controlled United States Congress is the problem for America's energy crisis. Look no further. The Democrat-controlled Congress, under their leadership, their auspicious leadership, has led to an increase of 76 percent in the price of gasoline at the pump.

□ 2200

Seventy-six percent increase. I've only been here 20 months, and we've seen gas prices go up 76 percent under Democrat-controlled leadership.

Minority leader JOHN BOEHNER made a decision late in the month of July. He decided to lead 10 Republicans to go up to Alaska to visit the ANWR region that has been so vilified, that we've been told that we absolutely cannot drill up in ANWR, that somehow the world will come to an end if we drill in ANWR. Well, JOHN BOEHNER, with his leadership, took 10 Republicans—and I was blessed enough to be one of those Republicans to go not only to Colorado to visit the National Renewable Energy Laboratory, but also up to Alaska to ANWR.

And there is one little story that I want to tell the American people before I hand this over to my colleagues to continue, and it's this: While we were up in Alaska visiting our oil-rich region where we were able to go to the North Slope—here is the North Slope of Alaska. Thirty-one years ago, the North Slope of Alaska was the largest producing oil field in the United States. Sadly, 31 years later, this is still the largest producing oil region. Why? Because we have a Prohibition-era mentality when it comes to production of American energy legislation. Because this Congress has made a deci-

sion: No more energy production here; if we're going to have energy, we've got to buy it offshore. Well, that is ridiculous; it's why we're in the situation we're in.

But here in the North Slope 31 years ago, when we began building this energy lifeline which is our North Slope Trans-Alaska Pipeline which extends 800 miles from Prudhoe Bay down to Valdez, when we built that 31 years ago we were producing 2.1 million barrels of oil a day. Do you know where we're at now? Seven hundred thousand barrels a day. Within 10 years we will be down to \$300,000 barrels a day. You know what happens, Mr. Speaker, when we get down to 300,000 barrels a day? When we get to that point, this energy lifeline that feeds the lower 48, it's going to shut down. And, I mean, when it shuts down, you can't add another oil field and bring it back up into production. And do you know, Mr. Speaker, what it costs us to replace this energy lifeline? Fifteen billion dollars. And it isn't just the \$15 billion, it would take several years to rebuild this because this pipeline is made out of stainless steel, and stainless steel doesn't come cheap anymore.

We are in trouble. Because if, as the Democrat nominee, BARACK OBAMA, has said, he doesn't plan to do any more drilling, and Speaker PELOSI, NANCY PELOSI, the Democrat-controlled House, has said she really doesn't plan any more drilling, or as HARRY REID has told us, he really doesn't believe in more drilling, if the Democrats have their way, there won't be more drilling. And so we will have this energy pipeline that has served our interests for over 31 years, it's going to shut down within 10 years time. Shut down. So if we thought \$4 a gallon was a lot to pay for energy, we're going to think that's a cheap date because it's going to be \$6, \$8, \$10 a gallon because the Democrat-controlled Congress has said, no how, no way, not on their watch are we ever going to start drilling. It's not going to happen. And it's not going to happen under BARACK OBAMA.

There is a very real choice that the voters have to make come this November, and it's this: Do you want to pay \$2 a gallon for gas under a President MCCAIN and a Vice President Palin—who will drill, by the way, for new energy—or do you want to pay \$6, \$8 or \$10 a gallon for gasoline very soon under a BARACK OBAMA and a Democrat-controlled Congress who said no way, no how, never under their watch will they begin the drilling process? It's that simple: \$2 a gallon, or \$6, \$8 or \$10 a gallon? That's what the American people will be asking themselves.

And I'll tell you one thing, under a Republican-controlled Congress, if we can get there this fall, this November, there will be a change. There will be drilling in ANWR. There will be drilling in the oil shale region. There will be drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf. There will be expansion of clean coal technology. There will be building of 45 new nuclear power plants. Instead

of being the world's greatest dependent on foreign energy importation, we will become the world's leading exporter of energy.

Can you imagine? Millions of jobs, high-paying jobs. And I will end with this. As a matter of fact, up in Alaska, what I was told is that entry-level jobs on the North Slope pay over \$100,000 a year plus benefits. There's a lot of people from the great State of Minnesota that would go up to take those jobs.

We have the answer. We have got the ticket. We don't have to be mired under \$4 a gallon gas or \$6 or \$8 or \$10. Under a Republican-controlled Congress, Mr. Speaker, the American people will get back to paying \$2 a gallon or less. This is real, and it can happen very quickly. And that's why I'm so grateful to the gentlelady from North Carolina for bringing this important discussion and reminding the American people that under a Democrat-controlled Congress we've seen gasoline prices increase 76 percent. And that can take a nosedive if we see real change at the ballot box this November.

Ms. FOXX. Well, I thank my colleague, Congresswoman BACHMANN from Minnesota. And I want to say she has boiled it down to a very simple fact. And I say that people in this Congress are either pro American energy or anti American energy. And I think we know the difference in the two groups of folks.

The people who don't want us to produce energy in this country are anti American energy. They don't want us to be independent of these foreign countries. It is a difficult thing for me to understand, it's a difficult thing for my constituents to understand.

And as our colleague, Mr. DENT from Pennsylvania, said, we want all those alternatives, but they only produce a small part of what we're going to need. Perhaps eventually we will have the technology to produce more of it. But we have to increase our supply of gas and oil and other fossil fuels to get us through this situation that we're in now until we get to those alternatives. And certainly we want them, but they're a small part right now of what we can produce.

Other people who have joined us tonight include my great colleague who is on the Constitution Caucus with me and is often here speaking on the Constitution, a former teacher from the State of Utah. Now, former teachers like Congressman BISHOP and I often have tendencies to speak for 50 minutes at a time, but since there are other folks here tonight, I'm hoping he is not going to speak for 50 minutes. But he is going to be very eloquent in what he shares with us.

I yield to my colleague, Mr. BISHOP from Utah.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I thank you for that kind introduction. And it won't be

50 minutes unless I go into Mr. KING's time in some particular way.

I'm excited to be here to join you and to join the others, especially the gentlelady from Minnesota, who painted such a marvelous vision of what we could, indeed, be doing in the future if we just come together on this particular issue.

There are many people who have said, you know, where have we been all these years on this particular issue? I haven't been here forever, but I do know, from my years here as well as in the State legislature in Utah, that we have been arguing this issue for years.

One of the freshman Members today came to the floor and criticized us for why we haven't done any of these issues earlier. And the bottom line is: We did. I have not been here forever, but there have been countless votes I have made in favor of drilling in ANWR and I would do so again. I have made countless votes in this body on expanding our offshore drilling leases and permits in areas and would do so again.

From the very first day I came here, JOHN PETERSON has been extolling the problems this economy will face if we don't face up to the fact we have a dwindling supply of natural gas here in the United States. We have been talking about this forever. Even before Speaker PELOSI changed my mindset and told me that natural gas is not a fossil fuel and you don't actually have to drill to get it, despite that fact there is something that is different now. And like most issues that come to their prime, there is a catalyst that changes and a catalyst that drives the issue forward. We have seen that this year.

I come from the West, which is the energy-producing section. Some of my friends in the areas that I call the "energy consuming" sections have been very happy over the years to try and lock up areas of the West and areas off the coast which produce energy, and they can do it with impunity because it has no impact on their lives. But all of a sudden, when you start paying 4 bucks a gallon of gas, then something is different.

The massive spike in gasoline prices at the pump over the last 2 years is the catalyst that is taking the arguments—and the arguments that we have said over and over and over again year after year—and have finally driven it to the point where everyone realizes mistakes we have made in our energy policy and our land policy for the past 30 years have brought us to the situation where we are today. And the cost we are paying at the pump is because of misguided decisions we have made for over 30 years. And now is the time where Americans are ready to stand up all over this country and say now is the time we need to take a new direction with real solutions so that we can solve where we have been brought by past decisions.

And as has been stated before, we're not just talking about drilling. It's one of the common arguments they say, all

Republicans want to do is drill. Yeah, we want to drill, but we have always said it's not drilling alone. When we say we need an all-of-the-above solution, it means we need an all-of-the-above solution.

The common fossil fuels are as important to solve our energy problem now as expanding alternative energy sources will be to solve our problem in the future. But one of the issues we have never faced in this country—once again, another decision we've made improperly years ago—is an adequate way of funding our investment and expansion of alternative resources.

Now, one of the things we could do if we actually do increase our production of oil and natural gas and oil shale and coal is to use the expanded royalties this Federal Government would receive and funnel those royalties into building and developing our alternative resources for the future. And that's what the all-of-the-above American Energy Act wants to do. It is both of those.

I have found, to my utter amazement, there is no source of energy that does not have its critics. How can one be opposed to solar power? Although when we tried to build a solar plant in New Mexico, people were opposed to it because it would take up too much of the desert. How can you be opposed to wind power? Although I was reading an article in a local paper of a farmer in Wyoming who was opposed to wind power plants simply because the wushing of the blades makes too much noise, or it chops up too many birds that are part of the Migratory Bird Treaty.

Every source of energy has somebody who is opposed to it, which is why, if we're really going to reach a consensus of everybody, the only solution is to say nothing is off the table, we develop everything. It is the only real solution, it is the only fair solution, and that's what we are after. If we care about consumers in the future, we develop everything.

Conservation is essential, but we all know conservation alone does not solve our problem. But the American Energy Act is the only bill that actually has real incentives for Americans to conserve and rewarding them for efforts to conserve. We realize we do not have the infrastructure to move energy from one part of this country to the other. And the American Energy Act is the only one that realizes we must put extra money and effort into building our infrastructure or everything else is useless. We are the only ones that realize it has legal impediments. As was mentioned before, as soon as you open up an area, it is immediately open to open-ended standing so that anybody can sue, and that is, indeed, what happened. And in the Americans for American Energy Act, that is the only area that actually talks about reforming that process so that once a decision has been made, we can move forward.

The American Energy Act is the only one that recognizes solutions are made

by people out there, because within the soul of American people is the creativity we need to solve our problems. And what we should be doing as a government is not trying to dictate solutions from here in these hallowed halls, but allowing Americans to find their solutions by themselves and then rewarding them for it.

When England became a superpower on the oceans, they did not have a way of mapping the oceans, so they established a prize of 20,000 pounds to the first person who could figure out how to do it. And the British clock maker from London who invented latitude and longitude, we are still using his invention. When Napoleon started marching with his troops, he realized he did not have a way of feeding them, so he gave a 14,000 frank prize to the first person to solve the problem. The vacuum-packed concept of food is the same thing he invented for 14,000 franks and we still use today. When Lindbergh flew across the ocean he was after a prize from a newspaper. And the aeronautics industry has developed from it.

All we need to do is say we will reward Americans for coming up and producing a solution and reward them well for it, and they will solve the problem without our expert attention driving that way.

Now, we've heard a lot of blame about the problem. We've heard Big Oil blame because they're gouging people, therefore let's tax them—which is what we tried 30 years ago when the development dried up; or we have said that they have leases out there they're not using it, so use it or lose it—even though that's exactly what the status quo is, indeed, doing. We've had all sorts of other ideas that Big Oil is the problem here. As Newt Gingrich said, if you really want to help Exxon, do nothing. They already have their oil. Sixty-eight percent of all the oil that is being drilled in this country and 87 percent of all the natural gas being drilled in this country today are being done by small entrepreneurial companies, 200 employees or less, names of which no one in this body has ever heard.

If we really want to expand our economy and add competition, which will lower price, expand the efforts of people to become involved in this process. What we need is not another political scheme, we have had 30 years of them; we need real solutions. And that is what we want, a vote on a real solution, not some faux solution, a real one that actually addresses real issues for real Americans and solves their real problems.

□ 2215

Groucho Marx once said that "politics is the act of looking for the trouble, finding it everywhere, diagnosing it incorrectly, and applying the wrong remedies." If we're not careful, that's exactly what we could do in these next 2 weeks. We can't just go for the cheap fix political deal. We have to go for a

real solution that helps real people. And that's the vote that we demand.

Ms. FOXX. I thank my colleague from Utah. He never disappoints. We got not only a very concise discussion of the problem but some wonderful history lessons in the process.

I want to now recognize another distinguished and very eloquent person in our Congress, a member of the Republican leadership and chairman of the Republican Policy Committee, THADDEUS MCCOTTER from Michigan. He's our second person from Michigan tonight, but THADDEUS is the kind of person who, when he speaks, everybody listens because we have to listen very closely to make sure we don't miss all of that wit and innuendo that he'll share with us.

I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MCCOTTER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I have great empathy for the gentleman from Utah who hoped for a big ending. I would prefer just a passable beginning; so bear with me.

I come from the State of Michigan, as my colleague who spoke earlier, PETER HOEKSTRA, so well earlier discussed. We are a State that is suffering. We are a manufacturing State that has seen job losses for several years in a row. And what we have also seen because of the high price of energy is a drop-off in our tourism trade both from Michigan residents inside the State who could not afford to take a family vacation and for people who come to our wonderful Great Lakes State to recreate. This is a twofold problem which has done something to the State of Michigan which has happened to no other of the 49 States. Last year Michigan became the only State in the Union to have a rise in poverty and a decrease in median income.

The cost of energy is exacerbating this suffering greatly. Now, because my State wants to work under difficult economic times, I want to express the absolute disgust that many of us have for the way people who have been elected by the sovereign citizens of the United States to serve in this Congress have worked on their jobs. We have seen over the month of August in America 84,000 American jobs lost in large part due to energy costs. In response, the Democratic-controlled Congress took a 5-week paid vacation.

On our part as Republicans, we came to this floor every day this Congress should have been in session and had a speak-in with the American people about what we hoped to do on their behalf if given the chance by the Democratic majority to actually come here and earn the salaries that we were being paid. We got no response from the Democratic Party. But we did get a response from the American people. And the response that we got from the American people was loud and clear: It was we would like to have a fair up-or-down vote on the bipartisan all-of-the-above American energy strategy.

What is in this? As the speaker from Utah stressed, it is not simply a drill-only bill. It has three key components as we move towards an important goal. The first is maximum American energy production. The second is common-sense conservation. The third is free market green innovations.

Now, why do we need all three? So we can have a responsible transition to American energy security and independence. If we do not recognize that this problem is one of supply and demand, if we do nothing to increase the supply, you can do one of two things: You can let the cost continue to escalate or you can focus on the demand. If you focus solely on the demand, what you are doing to the American people is saying what some people have said about American gas prices: "We are better off without cheap gas." This is a cold turkey policy which for ideological reasons will accomplish nothing but pain and suffering unnecessarily on the American people's family budgets and on their pursuit of the American Dream, which I point out is not necessarily to be mandated that it has to occur on foot. We want a responsible transition to American energy security and independence, one that makes the American people full participants in this transformational undertaking and does not continue the state of affairs that is occurring now here in their own country.

Who are the best friends of Big Oil? My friend from Utah touched upon it. The best friends of Big Oil are the people who do nothing. And for 5 weeks we saw who was doing nothing and we saw who was trying to do something. If you want to be a friend to Big Oil, continue the government-mandated rationing of American energy. Stop Americans from extracting their own natural resources to increase supply as we transition to American energy security and independence because if you do not allow that supply to increase here at home, American oil from American soil, you're going to continue to see prices rise. You're going to continue to see the Big Oil companies that you claim not to like reap even greater harvest at the gas pump, and meanwhile you will know that you were complicit in this, and we will make sure that the rest of the country does too.

In the final analysis, if we do not have a fair up-or-down vote, the suffering is going to continue and no amount of political chicanery is going to mask the fact to the American people that you refused to act and when you were compelled to act, you refused to do anything substantive that was going to help them because all they have to do is drive. All they have to do is need any form of energy, be it gasoline, be it home heating oil, and check the price and see what did or did not occur on your behalf and who did or did not act.

When we came back into session, what did we find? We found trout waiting for us. We decided we were going to

do something about trout and perhaps that would spawn an energy bill that perhaps could help Americans. This is yet to prove the case because what we have seen is a continuation of the 5-week paid Democrat vacation that has stumbled into week 6 with nothing substantive being done about energy prices, an internal debate amongst their own caucus as to what to do if to do anything. And we stand here with not a bluff but a bill. We have stood here with the American Energy Act and asked for one thing: an up-or-down vote. They have refused.

I have no doubt that as we proceed in this process, the American people are not only going to be outraged by the fact that we have done nothing on energy to help them, they are going to look at a calendar as put forward by the Democratic majority in this Congress that has something that you who work for a living could never do. Between August 1 and January 1, this Democratic Congress cares so much about working Americans and energy that they will meet for 15 working days out of 5 months for full pay. You try doing that at your job, if you're lucky enough to have one, thanks to this Democratic Congress.

Ms. FOXX. Again, I promised you eloquence and you received eloquence.

I want to share with you some of the bills that the Democrat Congress has been presenting to us to vote on while they have been ignoring the need to vote on the American Energy Act.

How about this one: recognizing the American Highway User Alliance on its 75th anniversary. Now, that was a really important bill for us to be voting on.

Or how about what we did this week: condemning the use of television programming by Hamas to indoctrinate hatred, violence, and anti-Semitism toward Israel in young Palestinian children. I am one of the biggest supporters of Israel that you will find, but I don't think that our passing this bill had one wit of difference on Hamas.

Another really significant bill: supporting the goals and ideals of National Passport Month. When we should have been dealing with American energy, we were passing that bill.

We also passed a bill recognizing the 100th anniversary of the declaration of the Muir Woods National Monument by President Teddy Roosevelt. All of us Republicans are very glad to see Teddy Roosevelt honored because he's the original conservationist. He set the tone for Republicans, and we all know that. But I'm sure Teddy Roosevelt would have rather we had been dealing with the American energy situation and not commemorating something he had done because it was the right thing to do.

Two hundred and eighty-two laws have passed in the 110th Congress. Thirty-seven percent of them have named buildings or lands. Thirty-seven percent of them passed unanimously. Another fifteen percent extended the law or made technical corrections to



an existing law. This Congress has done nothing while the American people have suffered.

The Democrats' answer to the needs of the American people for lower gas prices is "drive small cars and wait for the wind." Ladies and gentlemen, that should not be the response of this Congress to the needs of the American people. When gasoline prices are \$4 a gallon, we need to do something. And as my colleagues have so eloquently expressed here tonight, we can do something. We have it within our power to create all of the energy that we need in this country at very affordable prices. However, this Congress, led by Democrats, controlled by Democrats, having Democrats in charge, have done nothing to act on the needs of the American people. I think one of the most important things we were able to accomplish in August when many of us were here every day talking to the American people on this floor because, as people have said before, the lights were out, C-SPAN was off, the microphones were off—in fact, many of us have had trouble speaking with microphones again because we were on the floor speaking so many times without microphones. We brought the issue to the American people. We let the American people know who was in charge, who is in charge of this Congress. The American people have said we want something done.

The Speaker is saying they're going to bring a bill, but as my colleagues have said, we have been here all week. They had the whole month of August. They had 5 weeks to come up with something, in addition this week. No bill yet to vote on. And I will make one little correction to my colleague from Michigan who said we will be working for 15 days from August 1 until January 1. We are not going to be here on Friday; so it's only going to be 14 days. We're being paid to do that. The Democrats are in charge. It is their responsibility.

My constituents find it hard to understand how one person can be totally in control of what bills come for a vote in the House, but that is the case. Speaker PELOSI, a San Francisco Democrat, is the person who controls whether we vote on bills on the House floor. And you need to let your interests be known to her and to your Democratic Congressman if that's who you have representing you.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the leadership for giving us this hour.

□ 2230

#### ENERGY POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HALL) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HALL of New York. I must comment on the gentlelady's remarks that just preceded me and describe them as fiction. I'm sorry to have to say this

because many things have happened in this body on a bipartisan basis, especially on the Veterans' Committee that I serve on, where we are in almost unanimous agreement on all issues. But on the issue of energy, our colleagues across the aisle keep going on dishonest tirades about our national energy crisis in order to distract from their record of oil company capitulation and failure to protect consumers.

I guess they're operating under their party philosophy that if you repeat something often enough, you can make people forget that it's not true. I actually have more faith in the American people than that.

They know that for most of this decade energy policy has been written in the White House by Big Oil and led to record dependence on imports and skyrocketing prices. They know that Republicans in this Congress have been pursuing a none-of-the-above strategy, blocking every attempt to move forward at real energy solutions. At every step, they have said no.

They said no to responsible drilling in Alaska and making oil companies drill on the 68 million acres that are already open. They said no to increasing oil supply through the SPR, releasing oil from our Strategic Petroleum Reserve, which is the only way to immediately bring down prices. They, our Republican colleagues, said no to reigning in market speculation to keep prices from skyrocketing. They said no to protecting the American driver from price gouging and oil company exploitation. And while they stood in the way, the American economy suffered and family budgets braced for high home heating costs.

I think it's time to share the views of most of Americans when I say enough is enough. We need more energy and we need to enter a new era of energy technology instead of staying stuck in this "drill first, ask questions later" mindset that will not lower prices. According to our own Energy Information Agency, at the most, it's 1.8 cents lower after 8 to 10 years, or possibly longer. It will not make us more energy secure, and it will not allow America to prosper, which is why I have joined with the rest of the majority to support drilling responsibly for more American oil. And that means, by the way, making sure that the American taxpayer and the Treasury get the money from our oil. Oil under Federal lands and offshore leases belongs to the American public, to our children and our grandchildren, and those royalties were given away by the previous Congress, which for 6 years had control of all branches of government, the White House, both Houses of Congress, and the court system. For 6 years they did nothing but give away our resources, our children's and our grandchildren's resources without asking for fair royalty payments by the oil companies.

We have provided key tax incentives for renewables, like wind and solar and high efficiency. And I beg to differ with

the gentlelady that spoke before me. These things are available today.

West Point, in my district, is putting in wind energy on their hundreds of acres of campus. They are putting in a 5,000-gallon E85 tank, which is actually a breakthrough, considering the fact that thousands of flex fuel vehicles have been sold in my State of New York, and there is hardly any place you can even buy flex fuel or E85.

We are seeing students at high schools like Arlington High School in Dutchess County, New York, come to me and to the New York State Energy Research and Development Authority and ask for money for solar panels so that their high schools can be powered today by solar power.

We have voted to break the chains of our dependence on Middle Eastern oil by using American innovation to create hundreds of thousands of green jobs that cannot be outsourced.

When I was in Denver a couple of weeks ago, I learned that one of the biggest new solar photovoltaic installations in Colorado was being built, fortunately, with American jobs doing the installation but, unfortunately, with solar panels that are being built in China.

We should not go from buying oil overseas to buying solar panels from overseas or buying wind turbines from overseas or buying geothermal systems from overseas. The country that put man on the Moon should lead the way in this technological innovation and develop this energy at home that's a broad, real energy policy. And it's time to pass that kind of complete really all-of-the-above plan now. It's time for action now.

#### ENERGY SOLUTIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 18, 2007, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I appreciate the honor to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the House of the United States Representatives. I have a series of subjects that I am interested in moving forward on.

Before I broach those subjects that might be illustrated on my left, I yield so much time as he may consume to the gentleman from east Texas, Mr. LOUIE GOHMERT.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thank my friend from Iowa for yielding. Of course, we have had a good bit of discussion on energy. One of the things that has gotten a lot of attention is this moratorium on drilling in the Outer Continental Shelf.

It was interesting to talk to RALPH REGULA, a Congressman here, who said he was here in 1981 when the first moratorium got put in place. If you go back to President Jimmy Carter, he signed a declaration stating that the Outer Continental Shelf was such an asset for this Nation that it should be



developed expeditiously. Those were the two words: Developed expeditiously.

So what happened to that? Jimmy Carter saying, Wow, we have got this fantastic resource for oil and natural gas that would help the American people and solve so much of our energy problems. What happened? Well, RALPH explained he was on the committee when there was some wealthy beach front owners, landowners in California, and of course there had been an oil spill around Santa Barbara in California, a bad spill. Amazingly, people complained about the drilling platforms when actually it's the tankers that spilled the stuff bringing it from other places.

But, anyway, wealthy, just the rich, who had beach front property, said they didn't want to look out there and have to see a rig, no matter that it might bring cheaper gasoline or cheaper natural gas prices, which could mean cheaper fertilizer, cheaper foreign products, cheaper plastics, cheaper all kind of things. Never mind about that. The wealthy didn't see that as a problem.

They didn't want to see the rigs out there so they begged and pleaded Congress to give a moratorium so there would be no drilling off the California coast. Well, they were apparently persuasive. They had plenty of resources with which to persuade the Congress. As I understood, it was back in 1981. They persuaded Congress to give them a moratorium.

Well, the recitation was such that then Florida said, Wait a minute. Those of us that are wealthy in Florida that have beach front property, we don't want drilling that might put a rig out there where we could see it off our coast. So never mind that it might provide cheaper gasoline, cheaper products, cheaper heating oil, cheaper things like that. Never mind that. We just don't want to look out from our expensive piece of property and even risk seeing a rig out there. So let's get a moratorium too. California got one. RALPH had warned that if you give California this moratorium, you will rue the day you did it.

Well, the wealthy there were able to persuade no drilling off the Florida coast. They got a moratorium. Before you know it, State after State was able to use and parlay California's and Florida's moratorium into not having drilling off their coast, until we get to the present day, where there's still these moratoriums off most of our coastline that could help our Nation become completely energy independent and say adios to this tremendous transfer of wealth that has been going over to some people that just flat don't like us and some of whom have supported terrorism. So it's important to know your history. In order to know where you're going, know your history.

So when we talk about this moratorium, that is what we are talking about, wealthy folks in the country

that didn't want to have to risk seeing a rig, never mind that the rigs could have been required to be far enough off the coast that they could not be seen from the coastline.

In Texas, we didn't have the moratorium. Louisiana didn't. So you can go down, and we did hear the stories that if you put a platform off the coast, then it's going to destroy all the fishing in the Gulf of Mexico. How terrible that would be. Well, they put the platforms out there and, lo and behold, the fish look at it as artificial reefs. Now, if you want to go fishing, a great place to go out is to the artificial reefs, which the fish look at them as, and they are actually just the platform that are producing.

So Carter wanted it developed expeditiously. I had tremendous problems with some of the things he did, like creating the problem in Iran when he cut the legs out from under the Shah and hailed the Ayatollah as a man of peace coming in, and we have been paying the price ever since then.

But here we have a majority that talks about being concerned about what they say is the little guy in America, what I would say are the hardest working people here. I have had union jobs lost in the last few years because natural gas prices were too high. It isn't helpful to keep putting our natural gas off limits. We are losing jobs that good, hardworking union workers should not have to lose to some country where they have got cheaper natural gas.

Also, ANWR, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. It is ridiculous not to drill that small area, compared to the millions of acres that would not be touched, that area where there's no wildlife, the area where there is nothing that would be disturbed, and produce that to bring a million, million and a half barrels on line. And it would not take 10 to 15 years. We have got a pipeline 74 miles away. That oil could be in the pipeline and coming this way in 2 or 3 years.

All of that said, we can then use the revenue, the royalties. People talk about subsidies and this kind of this. Make them pay royalties. The bills that we were pushing in the last Congress for 2 years had significant royalties that would go and be split between the States and the Federal Government. Tremendous revenue enhancers. You have could used that for the renewable energy, you could use that to shore up the hurting infrastructure of this country without raising taxes, and it would be producing new jobs.

One estimate says that if we allow the drilling in ANWR, it would immediately start producing 250,000 jobs, and we'd have 750,000 jobs by the time it was actually completed and the oil started flowing this way. I think solar, I know Boone Pickens is visionary on the idea of wind. That can help us out. But I think ultimately if we get the capacitors to ever store electricity, solar could provide all our power, and this

would provide the revenue to get on the way to do that, and we could say goodbye forever to this tremendous gross transfer of wealth to countries, so many of whom don't care for us.

So I appreciate my friend from Iowa yielding. I felt like as a follow-up on this discussion about energy it was very important for people to know the moratorium that will go out of existence come the end of this month, unless something is passed. And I know there are many wealthy people in the Senate, I know that there are millionaires here in the House who are really not bothered by the high gasoline prices. I hope that the Senators that are wealthy will feel and understand the pain of the hardworking Americans and not cut the legs out from under this program that could strengthen America for the next 200 years.

I hope they won't cave in because the hardworking Americans in this country need the help. This is one place we can provide the help.

May God bless this country. One way it can be is if we are allowed to utilize the resources with which we have already been blessed. But thank you to my friend from Iowa for yielding, and I yield back to him.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Texas, reclaiming my time, and I thank him for this transfer of wealth of knowledge to us, which we know in the brief time we have is a small component of the big picture but it adds a piece to the puzzle of the energy picture that we have been painting here every day in this 110th Congress for months and months and months, including every day, Mr. Speaker, that the House was designed to be adjourned for the August recess, as it's called. Republicans were here on this floor. Those cameras shut off, these microphones shut off, the lights shut down. We stayed here every single working day to carry the case to thousands of the American people who we brought down here on the floor of the House of Representatives to experience what a real debate was like, a real discussion was like.

□ 2245

I spent six to seven days here myself, Mr. Speaker. And although I saw a couple of Democrats lead a tour of people down here on the floor, I saw not one single one engage in this debate. The floor is always open for legitimate debate, and when it happens, I hope it is facts and not anecdotes.

A person who delivers this thing from a factual and occasional anecdotal but always a solid philosophical perspective is the gentleman from Michigan, the chairman of the Policy Committee, duly elected by his peers, and that is the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. THADDEUS McCOTTER, to whom I will yield.

Mr. McCOTTER. I thank the gentleman from Iowa, and I rise to address some of the issues that were raised by our colleague from New York, whose

sincere earnestness was not matched by his argument's accuracy.

Let us look at this situation squarely in the face. You can either increase America's supply of its own domestic natural resources in oil and gas, or you won't. Now, if you want to support it and increase the supply of American oil and natural gas, which we have to understand is that every time you play politics, for whatever ideological reason, to have government imposed rationing over America's production of their own domestic natural resources, you are going to increase the cost to the American consumers, because the more you hold back, the less supply is added, and this at the very time that global demand is increasing.

What you are going to want to do is increase the supply as best you can, as fast as you can, so you can help Americans who are suffering. What we have seen out of this Democratic party is quite simply a fig leaf plan to do nothing.

First, do-nothing bills that come to this Congress that are purported to be energy bills are in fact lethargy bills that are designed in fact to have a supermajority required to pass them. Why are they designed so have a supermajority to pass them? Why make it harder to do something that will actually help Americans at the pump? Because they are designed to fail, and they are not allowed to be amended by the Members on this floor. So this is part of a cynical strategy to put forward a do-nothing bill, get nothing done, and refuse to accept your accountability as the Democratic majority.

All we are asking the Democratic majority is to either agree with us to have a bipartisan vote on the all-of-the-above energy plan or to be honest with the American people. We have heard that somehow the Republican Party is engaged in a myth. Well, if it is a myth, then let us put it to the test on the floor with a vote. Let us see how many Democrats believe it is a myth.

The Republican Party can pass nothing in this House without Democratic support. We believe we have it, and if we don't, we will accept the defeat, move forward and try to find a way to work with the Democratic Party's leadership, which seems to believe that the United States does not need to increase its own domestic energy supplies, but rather needs to go cold turkey into an oil-free future, which I continue to stress is going to callously inflict pain upon Americans' pocketbooks and their quality of life.

This is an ideological battle, but it is not an ideological battle amongst the majority of Members of Congress. Again, I could be wrong, but give us an up-or-down vote.

In fact, as you know, through the Chair to the gentleman from Iowa, as you know, we have seen this Democratic Congress take a 5 week paid vacation while 84,000 Americans were put out of work. The Speaker of this House

had time to write a book, but not a bill on energy. We still do not have a bill on energy. We still have nothing in front of us, except what? A bill that has already been introduced called the American Energy Act. And whether it is fact or fiction, or good or bad public policy, we can debate that, if you let us. We can debate that and have a vote, if you let us.

If you allow this representative institution, this beckon of democracy to all the world to actually function as it is intended under the Constitution of the United States and as it has been entrusted to us by our constituents, put it up for a vote. Let our voices be heard on behalf of our constituents, and let the majority, if not a party prevail, but the people prevail. That is all we ask.

But let us be clear about what the stakes are and the positions are. We support an all-of-the-above strategy. We want maximum domestic energy production as a part of it. We do not want minimum energy production as part of an ideologically zealous pursuit of some unobtainable future in the near term which is going to devastate Americans' lives now.

I yield back.

Mr. KING of Iowa. I thank the gentleman from Michigan. And it occurs to me as I listen that not only is there no energy bill on the floor, there has been only one appropriations bill come through the House of Representatives, where all appropriations have to begin, Mr. Speaker, and that appropriations bill, of course, hasn't gone anywhere in the Senate. And this is the longest period of time in the history of the United States of America that this Congress has failed to do its duty and responsibly pass appropriation bills, that have to begin here by Constitution, do go over to the Senate, are to come back here in a conference report, generally speaking, unless the Senate agrees, and go to the President for his signature.

We are here knew on the eve of the seventh anniversary of September 11th. Tomorrow is the day, the seventh anniversary. And yet a few days later, at midnight, September 30th, if this Congress doesn't act, if the responsible assignments that should come from the Speaker of the House aren't brought forward, Mr. Speaker, this government shuts down. That means it shuts off all money going to the various departments of government.

I do not think that will be allowed to happen, because that would be too obvious to the American people as to what is going on here. But there is no energy bill. There are no appropriation bills.

But what we have seen in this 110th Congress is 40 resolutions, 4-0, 40 resolutions have been brought to the floor of the House of Representatives designed to unfund, underfund, or undermine our troops. We took votes on them and debated them intensively. And none of them went anywhere, Mr. Speaker, except they made their polit-

ical statement, which encouraged our enemies, discouraged our allies, discouraged our troops, and said to them that this Congress wasn't behind them.

I heard Member after Member say, "I support the troops, but I oppose the mission." I would submit that that is philosophically inconsistent. You simply can't take a position that says I want our troops to know that I am behind them, but I am not behind them if they have to go out and put themselves in harm's way in an operation that I disagree with.

This Congress voted to authorize the President to use military force in the places and locations that we are. And once that vote goes up, we are to stand together, not divided, and we are not to be going to foreign countries to negotiate with terrorists, tyrants, dictators, or any parts of any evil empire, carrying on foreign policy out of this Congress. That is the President's responsibility, by Constitution the commander-in-chief, and he conducts our foreign policy, Mr. Speaker.

I am fairly fresh back from a trip over to some of those parts of the world that have given us a significant amount of grief since September 11th, and among those places in the world, three stops that I will speak of tonight are Iraq, Afghanistan and the sovereign state of Georgia, all in that order.

My report, Mr. Speaker, back from Iraq, is the easiest one and it is the most optimistic one of the three to deliver. It was my sixth trip into Iraq over the time that I have been in Congress since the beginning of Operation Iraqi Freedom.

Over that course of time, I have made it a point to get around the country so that I can be in the different corners to see what is going on in places like Kurdistan, in Mosul, up in Irbil, down in Basra, certainly Baghdad, up to Ramadi and over to Fallujah, a couple of times to Fallujah, Taji comes to mind, Balad comes to mind, Baja comes to mind, at some of the places that I have had the privilege to go to get a sense and a feel for the things going on in that country.

Always briefed by our top officers, always had an opportunity to sit down the State Department, usually the U.S. Ambassador, usually also the corps commander of our military there on the ground. I met General Petraeus for the first time in Mosul when he commanded the 101st Airborne, that was in October of 2003. And as this situation unfolded, I met with General Sanchez, General Casey, and now back to General Petraeus again as the commander of our troops in Iraq. He is posed now to be raised up to be the commander of CENTCOM, and we will see General Odierno step in as the commander of our military in Iraq, entirely capable, and I think an excellent and wonderful choice, and someone whom I have met over there as well over the course of the travels.

One of the things I do as well as I go into a mess hall and I meet with

Iowans. It is something unique about meeting with troops from your home State. The troops from the home State just know that you know somebody that they know if in case we don't know each other, and they will always give me the straight line because they know that we have got a reference point and they know that they can talk to me in confidence and I am not going to blow their cover, so-to-speak, and they won't get into a problem with their commanding officer out of anything that I carry on from that conversation.

So I am able to cross-reference what our troops on the ground know, our frontline troops, all the way up through our officer corps at all ranks, and on to our ambassador corps as well. And I find our military gives us straight answers, and they have been doing a selfless job, and they believe in their duty, and they believe in their mission, and they believe in this country, and they are there because they want to take this fight off of their children and grandchildren, and also, Mr. Speaker, your children and yours and mine grandchildren as well.

I agree with them and I honor and salute them for it, and I stand with them, I support them, and I support their mission, because supporting our troops and their mission is integral. It cannot be divided. You can't separate the two. They have to go together, Mr. Speaker.

Here is what I see in Iraq. The casualty rates, the civilian casualty rates have dropped off more than 80 percent. I know that a year-and-a-half or so ago they were picking up about 50 bodies every morning out of the river in Baghdad. The sectarian violence was that bad and the power struggle that was going on was that bad.

The enemies that we were fighting in Iraq a year-and-a-half ago came down to these definitions. We were fighting, of course, al Qaeda in Iraq was our number one enemy. We were fighting al Quds, the Iranian influence of their training of terrorists and their arming of terrorists. They foment terror with whomever they can. But the Iranian influence was there.

We were fighting Muqtada al-Sadr, his al Mahdi military, his militia. That was three. We were fighting also the Badr Brigades, a couple of different divisions, a couple of different separations or identities of them. Organized crime was another component. The pure power struggle going on within the communities was another component of fight going on a year-and-a-half ago.

But I would have to say that al Qaeda in Iraq was number one, probably al Quds, the Iranian influence was number two, Muqtada al-Sadr was number three. Former Ba'athists, I didn't mention them, was another enemy we had. Then organized crime, then the Badr Brigades and another Shia group that was in there.

So it comes to five, six or seven different enemies that were cluttering up

the battlefield and causing a lot of casualties and making it difficult to know which way to turn because it was an asymmetric war.

Fifty bodies roughly a day being picked up out of the river in Baghdad I mentioned. The situation was grim. Al Anbar province was so dangerous that a Member of Congress could not go in there just a little more than a year-and-a-half ago.

So I reviewed that, and went and visited those areas that I could at that time. This was Thanksgiving, a year ago last Thanksgiving. And I went back about seven months later, probably eight months later, at the end of July last year. Things had gotten better. When I couldn't go to al Anbar province during Thanksgiving of 2006, I could go in there in July of 2007, and I did. And I went to Ramadi and in fact received a briefing there from the Marine general that was commanding that region, all of al Anbar province, and saw the change that had taken place.

That is the famous Sunni awakening, the Sunni awakening that was triggered by the surge, the surge which made a commitment to the military operations in Iraq, that said to the Iraqis, we are here, we are with you, and we are not leaving.

When that happened, it triggered the Sunni awakening, and they decided they would throw their lot in with the side that was going to be the winner. They were tired of the tyranny and the brutality of al Qaeda, and they understood who it was and what kind of people they allowed in their midst. They turned the other way and decided to join with us and provide the intel and also lead a good number of the military missions to go in and purge al Qaeda from al Anbar province. That was happening while I was there a year ago last July, Mr. Speaker.

And as I looked at the map that showed the mosques and what they were preaching in their services in the mosques, there was a time when it was about a 90 percent anti-coalition message. By then, by a little over a year ago, it was a 60 percent neutral message, 40 percent pro-coalition message. No mosque that they had for record was preaching an anti-coalition, anti-American message. It was a significant sea change that was taking place there. When the Iraqis, the Sunni Iraqis came around on our side, they began to purge al Qaeda from their midst.

A little more than a year later, I went back, 13 months later to be more accurate, Mr. Speaker, and went into some of the same regions and met with the Marine unit that was there, a different commanding general there this time, this time General Kelly. What I saw was something that was even safer yet, and much improved, al Anbar province.

□ 2300

In those trips, I went shopping in downtown Ramadi. I went back to Fallujah. There was a time I couldn't

do that. Yet I'd been in Fallujah in June 2004. I wasn't able to go to Fallujah in 2006. It was too dangerous because al Qaeda owned al Anbar province, and they do not any longer. There are some traces of al Qaeda in the province, but they barely exist. They're in little camps out in the desert, and they're being mopped up by the Iraqi defense forces and by our defense forces as well, Mr. Speaker.

Now, 11 of 18 provinces in Iraq have been turned over to the Iraqis for primary security, and that 11th one just happened here this past week with al Anbar province being that large area. It's about a third the area of Iraq and the population only about 5 or 6 percent of it, but it was turned over to the Iraqis, 11 of 18 provinces. If you look at the map of those 11 of 18 provinces, there are those that are not yet turned over to the Iraqis for security. As to this incremental, one province at a time, if the security allows for that, those that are still under U.S. primary security responsibility are the provinces that are most likely to still have some al Qaeda in Iraq in them. They are being mopped up systematically. At the progress rate they were going, it looks to me like a year from now it's going to be hard to find "al Qaeda in Iraq" in Iraq. It looks like the progress that's being made is very, very positive. So there has been significant progress made there.

Civilian casualties are off more than 80 percent. Sectarian violence is measured this way by sectarian death. In Baghdad since mid-April, statistically, we don't have a single sectarian death on our charts. If you look at sectarian deaths in Iraq as a whole, in Iraq proper, there have been about a handful of sectarian deaths since mid-April till today. So, if you look at the line on the charts, that number was going on someplace over 2,000 in a matter of a limited period of time—and I believe it was a week—and I hesitate to say so specifically, Mr. Speaker, but that number on the chart goes up over 2,000, and now it goes down to zero on sectarian violence.

You see that measure. You look at American casualties in Iraq. There was a period of time for 7 weeks, from the 1st of July until into August—I think that date would be about August 18—where the combat deaths in Iraq were exactly the same as accidental deaths in Iraq for American troops. There were 15 accidental deaths and 15 hostile deaths that took place in Iraq on American troops. That's the measure that, I think, is the one that provides the most optimism for me when the relative risk to being, let's just say, in a Humvee wreck is equivalent to being shot by a sniper or from having an IED detonated in a fatal fashion. Those measures tell me that security is going up and that violence is going down dramatically. If you look at the charts on the attacks that are taking place, whether they be on Iraqi forces or on

U.S. coalition forces, all of those numbers are down. They're down to historically low levels, down to the levels where they were right after the liberation of Iraq that took place in March and in early April of 2003. That should give us great hope, Mr. Speaker.

The situation in Iraq today is not yet what we can call a victory, but it is, I believe, what we'll be able to look at to say we know what victory will look like from here if we can sustain these low levels of violence and if we can drive them down even further.

We have to remember that Iraq is a more violent country than we are here in the United States of America as a whole. So, traditionally, they've had more violence. They have more violence that comes from people settling scores, from having more grudge matches. They don't have the long tradition of the rule of law like we have in the United States.

I just came from a reception where I joined with Judge Juhi, who was one of the judges who sat in judgment of Saddam. Many of you will remember him—a youthful judge who was the first one to retort back to Saddam when Saddam asked him "Who appointed you?" Judge Juhi said, "You appointed me and I'm doing my job." This man is now in the United States, and I'm proud to have him here. I'm proud to welcome him here to the American soil. I met with him in Iraq. He showed courage. He stood up for the rule of law at great risk. I recall at least one judge who was killed in this. Judge Juhi did survive this and has come through it all, and that's the kind of courage that we're seeing in the Iraqi people as they step up to defend their own freedom, Mr. Speaker.

Some of these measures are this: The level of security in Iraq probably never gets down to the level of security in the United States. They're a different kind of people than we are. There are more violent countries in the world than Iraq as well, and I could name you a few of them. One of them is Colombia. Their numbers have gone down, but about 3 years ago, when I committed some of their violent numbers in the world to memory, they had about 63 violent deaths per 100,000. The most violent country in the world is Swaziland. There are 88 violent deaths per 100,000 in Swaziland. That sounds horrible to think of that, that 88 out of 100,000 would be killed in a year in a country like that. Well, in Iraq, their violent death rate is down around 23 per 100,000 today. It was 27.51 back in 2005. Today, it's 23 per 100,000, and that includes the violent deaths across the country.

I have been accused, Mr. Speaker, of laying out, roughly, 3 years ago statistics and that this was a false quote. It was not something that I'd said, but I was accused of saying that it was more dangerous for my wife to live in Washington, DC—this is in 2005—than it was to live in Baghdad. In 2005, Mr. Speaker, we didn't have legitimate numbers

on Baghdad's violent death rates, and so I didn't quote such a thing, but I can say today, Mr. Speaker, that now we do have legitimate statistics on Baghdad's violent death rates.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell you without hesitation that it is today more dangerous to live in Detroit than it is to live in Baghdad. It's safer to be in Baghdad than it is to be in Detroit. Do you know it's safer to be in Detroit than it is to be in Washington, DC, and it's safer to be in Washington, DC than it is to be in New Orleans, and it's more dangerous to be in New Orleans than it is to be in Swaziland? That puts it in perspective, Mr. Speaker.

The violent death rates go like this: 88 per 100,000 for Swaziland, 23 per 100,000 for Iraq, 41 per 100,000 for Detroit. I've got to guess at this number now because Washington, DC's numbers have gone down. They've gone down from, I think, about 46 per 100,000. That number is a little bit lower than that, but it's still above Detroit's at 41 per 100,000. New Orleans used to have a number of about 53 per 100,000. Post-Katrina, it has posted violent death rates of up to 90 violent deaths per 100,000. It's more dangerous in New Orleans than it is in Swaziland. It's more dangerous in Detroit than it is in Baghdad. It's more dangerous in Washington, DC than it is in Baghdad. That puts this all into perspective for us. As for the safety in the entire country of Iraq, aside from Baghdad averaged into that, it is still safer to live in Iraq than it is to live in Oakland, California, and it actually has been for some time. That's a sign of success. We see the film on the violence that comes constantly out of that part of the world, Mr. Speaker, but we ought to also pick up on some optimism because our troops have done their job.

The Iraqi Government is stepping up. They're sitting on a \$79 billion fund. I want to call it a surplus, but it really is not. They're having difficulty allocating those funds and in getting them out to the local political subdivisions and in getting them out to the Iraqi people. They don't have a tradition of anything except central command, and people are reluctant to make decisions for fear they will be accused of fraud or corruption. So, if you don't make a decision, you cannot be accused of doing very much, and that delay that's part of a culture of not having a delivery system is starting to cause some problems in Iraq, but it's the right kind of problem to have: \$79 billion and not being able to figure out quite how to spend it.

They need to develop their oil industry, Mr. Speaker. They had, I believe it was, five oil companies and six contracts that they had signed to ask these oil companies to bring their technical expertise into Iraq and to evaluate inventory—the wells inventory, the supply of untapped energy that they have and the inventory of the pipelines, the delivery system, the processing, the entire network of oil. These

companies were negotiated contracts. I understood they were no bid contracts. They would now be working on developing those oil fields in Iraq. Instead, Senator SCHUMER from New York, Senator MCCASKILL and, I believe, Senator KERRY from Massachusetts all lined up and signed a letter, criticizing the no bid contracts that Iraq had entered into.

The result of that was they pulled those contracts down, and Iraq has been set back another year on developing their oil. They're doing that at a time of record high oil prices. So the delay on this won't just be they don't get to sell that number of barrels of oil next year or the year after or the year after, but the profit that comes from high oil prices needed to be capitalized on. They're set back at least a year, Mr. Speaker, because of interference on the part of the United States Senate in the sovereign business of Iraq. We said we didn't go there for their oil. Why are we sticking our nose in that business? They wanted to award contracts to U.S. companies on a legitimate basis. Because they needed to move, they didn't have time to do bid contracts on this. They wanted to agree. They had the money. They could be working today, and they're not because of interference on the part of the United States Senate.

But Iraq is still moving forward, and they're producing more oil than ever before. They're producing more electricity than ever before. The oil is being refined in Baji, and it's going up the pipeline to the north and out to Turkey. It's also going down to Baghdad and on down to Basra, and it's being exported off of the two platforms that Iraq has out in the ocean. Their navy is patrolling those platforms and is providing security there. Progress is being made. There's a lot to be done in the country, but they do have an infrastructure, and they do have a tradition of education. They do sit on a lot of oil, and I believe they will for a long time be a moderate, Arab, prosperous ally to freedom in the Middle East. I'm hopeful that they will provide an inspiration for the Iranians to reach out and to grasp their own freedom in a fashion that the Iraqis have today.

That's Iraq, Mr. Speaker, and I'm encouraged by it, and I hope to be able to look back on this time and this date, perhaps, and see that the progress continues to be made and that the Iraqi people step up.

If there is anything that I'm concerned about there—and there are a number of things—it is that I'm concerned that the Iraqis are a little overconfident on their current military capability. I believe they undervalue American communications and American air cover and our backup firepower that we have and the logistics that support their operations, and so that's one of the concerns that I have about the Iraqis.

Another one would be, if Muqtada al-Sadr and the Iranians decided to light

it up again in Iraq, this could go south pretty fast. I don't think that al Qaeda can mount a tactical military approach again in Iraq under the situation they're in. They can do some terrorist attacks, but they can't do coordinated terrorist attacks of the magnitude they have done in the past. That's why the attacks and the violence have dropped off substantially, but you can see what victory can look like from where we are today in Iraq.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, Afghanistan is a bit of a different story. I went back to Afghanistan also a little over a week ago, and I traveled to the central and eastern and a little bit of the southern parts of the country in some regions that I hadn't been before—Kandahar. I traveled to the central and western parts of Afghanistan, to areas I hadn't been before. I had been to the east into the mountainous regions, to the northeast where the mountains go up pretty sheer, pretty vertically. It's sheer stone and rock, and there's not much going on with the exception of a little bit of civilization in the valleys. There are very narrow, little, green valleys with some vegetation.

I traveled west in Afghanistan, over to Kandahar, and then on down to a camp called Camp Bastion. The flight over that way is a different topography. It's mountainous, yes, but the mountains are simply dust all the way to the top with little valleys in between that are the narrowest slivers of green areas where there is some population that lives, Mr. Speaker. Then there are the high plains that lay out in a high plains desert. If you describe it in one word, Mr. Speaker, the prevailing situation in that part of Afghanistan—and it's a vast part of Afghanistan—is dust. There's dust everywhere. There's dust all the time. There's dust in the air. There's dust settling on everything. Actually, this is from Kabul all the way to the west as far as I've gone.

When you go through the market, you'll see the watermelons and tomatoes at this time of the year covered with dust that hovers in the air. The visibility is limited. There is meat hanging in open markets, some of it with the wrapping on it and some of it hanging out in the open, collecting dust from the air. Many times, our planes are grounded because the visibility is so low that they can't fly on or off the runway. There's dust everywhere.

□ 2315

And so dust is a prevailing piece. The roads, we built a ring highway around Iraq, and that is paved and that let's traffic get around the—excuse me—the ring highway around Afghanistan. And that's paved. It lets traffic go around that current in the ring highway, but the balance of the highways, with few exceptions, are dust, dirt, not gravel and not asphalt, not paving. They're dirt.

So in the summertime, this time of the year when the temperatures got to 125, it cooled off to 115 when we were there. Then the vehicles and any traffic, any animal traffic fills the air with dust. The wind blows and it fills the air with dust. Our troops get stuck in the dust. Their equipment will get stuck in the dust. It's that deep and that soft on some occasions.

And as the weather changes and we go into the winter time and the rainy season, then that dust turns to mud. And of course the equipment will be stuck in the mud instead of the dust. But the dusty covered mountains and the dust covered high plains going to the West from Kandahar on over, and looking across that countryside, and I asked the question of the veterans who were there that served for a long time in Afghanistan, do these mountains ever turn green? Do these high plains ever turn green? Is there vegetation that grows during a time of the season when it rains? And the answer is no. They just stay dust. And it's all dustier, except down in the narrow parts of the valleys where civilization goes up and down the valley. And that's of course where the Taliban travel, up and down the valley. And Helmand Province is one of the places where we were.

Afghanistan produces 90 percent of the world's poppies for opium and heroin. And 90 percent of that, 80 percent of Afghanistan's poppies are raised in Helmand Province. And so we were there.

It wasn't the poppy season. But the Taliban come up and they will front a crop and they'll say, here, I'll give you some money, half of what your crop is worth. Raise some poppies this year and I'll be back at harvest time to pick up the crop and I'll pay you the balance of what I owe you. We've got Taliban brokering, it's kind of like a farm bill or a banker; here's the front money, put your crop in, and we'll come back and collect the harvest of the opium crop that you have. We'll pay you the balance that we owe you and then they go back to Pakistan.

Taliban and al Qaeda will penetrate as far as they can go until they run into American troops, whether it's Marines in that area or Army troops in other areas. And there is far too much ranging of the enemy across that countryside. They've got too much freedom of movement. And yes, we're doing, I believe, as much as we can with the resources that we have there. But I look across at Pakistan, and up until a few days ago the leadership there was a jump ball. Yet, Pakistan is a sovereign sanctuary that neighbors Afghanistan.

I continually ask this question of our military historians, Mr. Speaker. Give me an example of an insurgency that was defeated by a foreign power, an insurgency that had a sovereign sanctuary to retreat and be resupplied and retrained and rearmed from. I've yet to get an answer to that question from any of our military historians as to

when a foreign power has defeated an insurgency, when those insurgents could retreat to another country that was a sanctuary. I don't believe it's ever happened in history.

So the situation that we're in today, Mr. Speaker, is, we either have to rewrite history, excuse me. We have to write new history. We have to write a new precedent for how to defeat a sovereign sanctuary that had, how to defeat an insurgency that has a sanctuary in a sovereign country. We either set new precedents for history, or we are slowly learning a bitter lesson of history. And today, Mr. Speaker, I don't know the answer to that question. It will be determined by history.

But at this point, I don't believe that we have a lot of options for September and October or November, except to maintain and limit the movement of our enemies there. There are at least nine different identifiable enemies there. I went through the list of enemies we had in Iraq a year and a half ago. The list of enemies is down now to where they barely exist there today.

But over in Afghanistan they list nine enemies for me and they call them the syndicate of enemies. I can't list them all from memory, but they include the Taliban and al Qaeda, seven other groups that are, most of them are camping in the mountains and training there and mounting their attacks from those locations where they believe that they are safe from American attacks. They aren't always. Sometimes we find an opportunity to strike a target in that region as well.

But with the unrest in Pakistan, with the new leadership that's just taken place there, with a presidential election coming up in this country, with resources that I believe need to be refurbished and reinforced in Afghanistan, this is the time that we begin to move on the political and the economic fronts until we can set the stage to eradicate that habitat that breeds terror in Pakistan.

It is a very tough nut to crack. It will be very difficult. I have said for years that we would be in Afghanistan longer than we'll be in Iraq. I said that because Afghanistan is closer to the stone age. They don't have the oil wealth that Iraq has. They don't have the prosperity. They have a Gross Domestic Product of \$7.5 billion, Mr. Speaker, and \$4 billion of that Gross Domestic Product is the poppies.

So I would submit that we should just simply remind Afghanistan, Afghan farmers, it's against the law to raise poppies, and we're going to enforce the law and it'll be Americans that do it if we need to. And as I had that discussion with some of the powers that be in that country, they said to me that the poppy crop in Afghanistan was the equivalent to, it was either one or two football fields wide all the way around the world. It would be impossible to go in and spray all those poppies.

And I brought up the fact that we've sprayed almost, we've sprayed most of

the acres of corn and soybeans in Iowa. And we did so in 6 weeks. And we have enough spray planes parked in the hangars in Iowa that that's the off season to go over there. I think that we could take care of the poppies in Afghanistan without breaking a sweat. Might get shot at a few times, but we would end that trade in opium that is funding our enemies.

This is a strange, strange war, Mr. Speaker, when we're paying an exorbitant price for oil, and that money goes into the pockets of people that don't like us very much. And some of it gets into the pockets of our enemy, called the Taliban and al Qaeda and a number of other enemies.

At the same time, the American demand for illegal drugs is funding the poppy trade in Afghanistan, along with the European demand for illegal drugs as well. They're tapping into that, and it's another place where we're funding our enemy. So we're paying for both sides of the war.

We're watching our economy atrophy because the cost of energy is going up and up and up while we're marching through this long hard slog.

As much optimism as I have for Iraq, as much caution as I lay out here for Afghanistan, I relate to that concern, Mr. Speaker, concern for Georgia. That was the last strategic stop on the trip, unless you count St. Paul, at the convention. And what I see in Georgia is this: I believe that—

Well, first, to take it to the Georgia situation, Mr. Speaker, I actually went in and Googled the exact quote so I could get right. Here's my recollection, and then I'll take it to the exact quote.

Back in the year I believe it was 1984 was the year, if I remember correctly, that Ambassador Jean Kirkpatrick stepped down as Ambassador to the United Nations. She was appointed by Ronald Reagan. She served there and served honorably and served well, and she left a legacy, but she decided it was time for her to leave that post. And so as she stepped down as Ambassador to the United Nations, I remember seeing an article, tiny little article on page 3 or 4 of the newspaper that I was reading at the time where it quoted her as saying that was going on in the Cold War was the equivalent of playing chess and Monopoly on the same board. The contest between the super power of the United States, super power of the Soviet Union, playing chess and Monopoly on the same board. And the question was, would we bankrupt the Soviet Union economically before they checkmate us militarily. Now that statement, and she sadly passed away a couple of years ago, Jean Kirkpatrick. But that statement was made by my recollection, 24 years ago. And it has often framed the viewpoint with which I look at this super power contest that's going on. And it really framed it when I watched the Berlin Wall begin to come down on November 9 of 1989, and it framed it more when the Soviet Union imploded, and I'll pick the date

December 31, 1991. We might call that the end of the Cold War, Mr. Speaker, but it was not to be.

Jean Kirkpatrick's exact quote, this is the way it shows up when you check it, as opposed to checking my 24-year-old memory, reads this. 1984. "Russia is playing chess while we are playing Monopoly. The only question is whether they will checkmate us before we bankrupt them." That was the statement that Ambassador Jean Kirkpatrick made in 1984. That's the statement I think illustrates what was going on then during the Cold War, and I think it's the statement that illustrates what's going on now in places like Georgia.

Putin has expressed that the most tragic thing that's happened in his lifetime was the collapse of the Soviet Union. And I would say, no, that marked the end of the Cold War. It was one of the best things that happened in my lifetime, perhaps the best thing that's happened globally in my lifetime. We see that differently.

He saw the Soviet Union as a power that perhaps needs to be reconstructed. And so when Putin came to power, we saw him consolidate his power and make his moves to negate legitimate elections, set himself so that he could be the power broker in Russia and really the true power in Russia.

We know that President Bush has said that when he looked in Putin's eyes he sees a friend. I understand the reasons for him saying that. But when JOHN MCCAIN said, when I look in his eyes I see KGB, and I think JOHN MCCAIN sees it clearly.

Putin is a KGB chess player, Mr. Speaker. And he saw what happened when the wall came down in 1989 and when the Soviet Union collapsed in the end of 1991. He saw that the Soviet Union had been bankrupted economically before they could checkmate the United States militarily. He saw that Jean Kirkpatrick's analysis was correct, and he saw it play out because we were better Monopoly players with our free market economy than the Soviet Union was chess players. We got there first because our economy was stronger. We upped the ante.

And by the way, we played chess on the board too. We had a military escalation. We built up our military, built up our troops. Ronald Reagan called for it. And he walked out of the nuclear missile negotiations in Reykjavik, Iceland he walked away from it, to the gasps of his own staff. And he went into Berlin and he said, Mr. Gorbachev, open this gate. Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall; and down it came. And down came the iron curtain, crashing with it. And the end of the Cold War on the last day of 1991 marked the end of the Soviet Union.

But Vladimir Putin has been putting this back together again. Humpty Dumpty fell off the wall and had a great fall. But Humpty Dumpty is being put back together again by Vladimir Putin.

And here's where this—now he's learned. Now, Mr. Speaker, he's learned this; that you can play chess or you can play Monopoly, but if you're going to be a master at this global hegemony that he is playing today, if you're looking for dominance and if you're looking to be a super power, then you have to play Monopoly and chess on the same board, and you have to do it masterfully.

So the Soviet Union's economy wasn't that strong. It's never been that dynamic. It's been focused on central planning, Mr. Speaker. But what has come along for them as a windfall because they happen to sit on a massive amount of the world's energy and the world's oil, and with high oil prices that went up to \$140 a barrel and perhaps more than that, Putin saw the cash come rolling in, so he didn't have to do a lot of smart things economically. All he had to do was keep producing oil, keep selling oil. And if he's doing that, then Russia is building up wealth and we're watching the West, the free world, we are energy consumers and we have energy deficits.

Europe, eastern and western Europe imports a lot of their own energy, natural gas and oil, and they import a lot of it from Russia. In fact, Europe imports 25 percent of their oil from Russia, and they import 40 percent of their natural gas from Russia.

So if Vladimir Putin can shut down the oil valve going into Europe, a huge oil pipeline coming into a free country means cheap energy. Energy is a component of every part of our economy. Everything that we buy and sell and trade, it takes energy to produce it, energy to deliver it, it takes energy to receive the delivery of it. It takes energy to heat our homes and our factories and air condition them and light them and get from place to place and manufacture and produce food, clothing, fiber, you name it. It all takes energy. And a nation that has an abundance of real cheap energy has a real big advantage over NATIONS that have only a little bit of energy. The high priced energy. And nations with costly energy cannot compete with other nations that have cheap energy, all other things being equal.

□ 2330

And so Putin knows that sitting there looking at this global chessboard, this global Monopoly board, simultaneously sitting on top of this oil, that if he can decide whether oil goes east or west, he can determine whether going to the east, whether China's economy prospers, or maybe the same oil going to the West, whether Eastern or Western Europe's economy prospers.

He built a Trans-Siberian pipeline to go to China to take Russian oil to China. And in Kazakhstan, they built an oil pipeline to take some of the massive amounts of oil they have in Kazakhstan into China. But from the same locations, Kazakhstan and that region—and here I have in this chart,



Mr. Speaker, I think I have got some of these countries, here is Kazakhstan—there's a significant amount of oil in this region here. Uzbekistan less oil, Turkmenistan even less. But this amount of oil in this region needs to come through.

There's a pipeline across the Caspian Sea, and then it comes from here into Georgia. This little country here, 4.6 million people, is Georgia. Tbilisi is where I was about a week ago, the capital of Georgia. This square right here is the square through which the pipelines across the Caspian Sea, the central Asian energy, oil and gas, if it's going to go to the west to get out through the Straits there at Istanbul and out into the Mediterranean and out into western Europe, it has to come through Georgia. Putin knows that.

He sits up here and in control of the Russian region looking at this oil that he has next door watching how it can be controlled, and it must come through Georgia. When I met with the Georgians, they said to me, "We always knew he was going to do this. We always knew the Russians would come in and occupy our country," because this square, Georgia, is the square on the chessboard where he can control whether this oil in this region comes into Europe or whether it goes on to the east on over to China, just off the chart here.

A pipeline exists to go from Kazakhstan to China. There's a pipeline that exists from Russia that goes on into Europe, several of them actually, and a pipeline from Russia that goes down into China, Mr. Speaker.

This is where the valve is right here. That's where he can turn it on and he can turn it off, and he can decide if it goes east or if it goes west. If it goes to the east to China, their economy prospers; if it shuts off the oil going to the West, these economies in Europe atrophy.

If he can team up down here with Ahmadinejad and the Straits of Hormuz, and they can threaten to—or close the Straits of Hormuz, they can also decide whether oil goes to the West, the free world, the Western Hemisphere, or whether it is stuck up in here in the Middle Eastern region. That is a powerful position to be in.

If he continues to build this triumvirate—which is, I believe, Putin, Ahmadinejad, and Hugo Chavez—Chavez's oil, he can shut that off as well. He can decide whether to sell it or not and who's going to get it.

So if you put those three guys at the same table, Putin, Ahmadinejad and Hugo Chavez, they would have control—presuming the Straits of Hormuz could be shut down by the Iranians or with Russian help—they would have control of more than 50 percent of the world's export oil supply. They could decide oil prices for the world: running them up, allowing them to go down and/or they could decide whether that oil actually goes to those economies.

They could decide whether the free world's economy would atrophy or whether it would prosper.

If you're in a position like that and you've had the lesson that Putin has had, he lost the Monopoly game and he checkmated his chess game, because their economy collapsed. He's learned the lesson. Now he's playing Monopoly and he's playing chess, and he's sitting on this square in Georgia. He's sitting on a massive amount of oil. He has a diabolical plan, and we're Americans sitting here naively arguing that well, we don't want to develop any American energy.

Mr. Speaker, we must open up all American energy now. Every form. It's imperative. Whether we're going to be a superpower 10 or 20 years from now depends on the decisions we make in this Congress today. All energy all the time. Drill ANWR, drill the Outer Continental Shelf, develop the oil from the oil shale areas in the West, open up all of our natural gas. Let's do coal, let's do nuclear, let's do ethanol, let's do biodiesel, let's do wind, let's do solar, all forms of American energy.

Let's save our freedom, Mr. Speaker.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. SENSENBRENNER (at the request of Mr. BOEHNER) for today until 2:30 p.m. on account of his primary election.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McDERMOTT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. McDERMOTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WOOLSEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ELLISON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KAGEN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. POE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LATTA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POE, for 5 minutes, September 17.

Mr. JONES, for 5 minutes, September 17.

Mr. KELLER of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WOLF, for 5 minutes, September 11 and 12.

(The following Member (at his request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. HALL of New York, for 5 minutes, today.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 11, 2008, at 11 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8183. A letter from the Captain, U.S. Navy Deputy Chief of Legislative Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting notice of the completion of a public-private competition for administrative support services, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2462(a); to the Committee on Armed Services.

8184. A letter from the Principal Deputy, Department of Defense, transmitting authorization of Daryl W. Burke, Scott M. Hanson and Jeffrey G. Lofgren to wear the authorized insignia of the grade of brigadier general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8185. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report concerning an amendment to Part 121 of the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR), promulgated pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, 22 U.S.C. 2778 et seq.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

8186. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Year 2007 Inventory of Commercial Activities, as required by the Federal Activities Reform Act of 1997, Pub. L. 105-270; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8187. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the Board's report entitled, "Federal Appointment Authorities: Cutting through the Confusion," pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 1204(a)(3); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

8188. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the 2006 Annual Report of the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3766(c) and 3789e; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8189. A letter from the Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's quarterly report from the Office of Privacy and Civil Liberties as required by section 803 of the Implementing Recommendations of the 9/11 Commission Act of 2007, Pub. L. 110-53, 121 Stat. 266, 360; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8190. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Standards; Engine Bird Ingestion [Docket No.: FAA-2006-25375; Amendment No. 33-23] (RIN: 2120-A173) received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8191. A letter from the Attorney Advisor Regulations and Administrative Law United States Coast Guard, DHS, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Maine; Sector Northern New England August Swim Events. [Docket No. USCG-2008-0695] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.



8192. A letter from the Attorney Advisor Regulations and Administrative Law United States Coast Guard, DHS, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone, 2008 Personal Watercraft Challenge, Atlantic Ocean, Fort Lauderdale, FL [Docket No. USCG-2008-0433] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8193. A letter from the Attorney Advisor Regulations and Administrative Law United States Coast Guard, DHS, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Regulated Navigation Area and Safety Zone, Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal, Romeoville, IL [Docket No. USCG-2008-0470] (RIN: 1625-AA11) received August 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8194. A letter from the Attorney Advisor Regulations and Administrative Law United States Coast Guard, DHS, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Carly's Crossing, Lake Erie, Buffalo, NY [Docket No. USCG-2008-0739] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8195. A letter from the Attorney Advisor Regulations and Administrative Law United States Coast Guard, DHS, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Seafair Fireworks, Lake Washington, Washington [Docket No. USCG-2008-0732] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8196. A letter from the Attorney Advisor Regulations and Administrative Law United States Coast Guard, DHS, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Temporary Safety Zone: Astoria Regatta Assoc. Display, Astoria, Oregon. [Docket No. USCG-2008-0726] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8197. A letter from the Attorney Advisor Regulations and Administrative Law United States Coast Guard, DHS, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Temporary Safety Zone: Red Bull Flugtag, Portland, Oregon. [Docket No. USCG-2008-0725] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8198. A letter from the Attorney Advisor Regulations and Administrative Law United States Coast Guard, DHS, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Patapsco River, Inner Harbor, Baltimore, MD [Docket No. USCG-2008-0392] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received August 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8199. A letter from the Attorney Advisor Regulations and Administrative Law United States Coast Guard, DHS, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Cape Fear Dragon Boat Festival; Wilmington, NC [Docket No. USCG-2008-0789] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received August 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8200. A letter from the Attorney Advisor Regulations and Administrative Law United States Coast Guard, DHS, Department of

Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Chris Craft Silver Cup Regatta, St. Clair River, Algonac, MI [Docket No. USCG-2008-0763] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8201. A letter from the Attorney Advisor Regulations and Administrative Law United States Coast Guard, DHS, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Fireworks, Beverly, MA [Docket No. USCG-2008-0349] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8202. A letter from the Attorney Advisor Regulations and Administrative Law United States Coast Guard, DHS, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zones: Annual Events Requiring Safety Zones in the Captain of the Port Detroit Zone [USCG-2008-0218] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8203. A letter from the Attorney Advisor Regulations and Administrative Law United States Coast Guard, DHS, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Temporary Safety Zone: LST-1166 Safety Zone, Southeastern Tip of Lord Island, Columbia River, Rainier, Oregon. [Docket No. USCG-2008-0755] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8204. A letter from the Attorney Advisor Regulations and Administrative Law United States Coast Guard, DHS, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; American Music Festival; Chesapeake Bay, Virginia Beach, VA [USCG-2008-0759] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8205. A letter from the Administrator, Bureau of Transportation Statistics, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Transportation Statistics Annual Report 2007, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 111(i); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8206. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Construcciones Aeronauticas S.A. (CASA), Model C-212 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0372; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-164-AD; Amendment 39-15425; AD 2008-06-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8207. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model MD-11, MD-11F, DC-10-30 and DC-10-30F (KC-10A and KDC-10), DC-10-40, DC-10-40F, and MD-10-30F Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-28351; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-074-AD; Amendment 39-15192; AD 2007-19-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8208. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Model A109C, A109E, and A109K2 Helicopters [Docket No. FAA-2008-0524; Directorate Identifier 2007-SW-77-AD; Amendment 39-15519; AD 2007-26-52] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 19, 2008,

pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8209. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 727-200 Series Airplanes Equipped with an Auxiliary Fuel Tank System Installed in Accordance with Supplemental Type Certificate SA1350NM [Docket No. FAA-2008-0013; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-230-AD; Amendment 39-15448; AD 2008-07-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8210. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-100, 747-100B, 747-100B SUD, 747-200B, 747-200C, 747-200F, 747-300, 747-400, 747-400D, 747-400F, 747SR, and 747SP Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2008-0412; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-290-AD; Amendment 39-15327; AD 90-25-05 R1] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8211. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 757 Airplanes Equipped with Rolls Royce RB211-535E Engines [Docket No. FAA-2007-0225; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-210-AD; Amendment 39-15583; AD 2008-13-20] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8212. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-400, 747-400D, and 747-400F Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2006-26110; Directorate Identifier 2006-NM-112-AD; Amendment 39-15585; AD 2008-13-22] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8213. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; ATR Model ATR42-200, -300, -320, -500 Airplanes; and Model ATR72-101, -201, -102, -202, -211, -212, and -212A Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2008-0293; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-287-AD; Amendment 39-15582; AD 2008-13-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8214. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Hartzell Propeller Inc. (JHC-)(2,3)Y(K,R)-2 Two- and Three-Bladed Compact Series Propellers [Docket No. FAA-2008-0254; Directorate Identifier 2008-NE-06-AD; Amendment 39-15591; AD 2008-13-28] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8215. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330 and A340 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0347; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-253-AD; Amendment 39-15437; AD 2008-06-25] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8216. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 777-200, -200LR,

-300, and -300ER Series Airplanes Approved for Extended-Range Twin-Engine Operational Performance Standards (ETOPS) [Docket No. FAA-2008-0673; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-117-AD; Amendment 39-15606; AD 2008-14-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8217. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330 Airplanes and Model A340-200 and -300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-0266; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-170-AD; Amendment 39-15576; AD 2008-13-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8218. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Model Mystere-Falcon 900 and Falcon 900EX Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2008-0365; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-274-AD; Amendment 39-15563; AD 2008-12-19] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8219. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Model Mystere-Falcon 20-C5, 20-D5, and 20-E5 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2008-0296; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-307-AD; Amendment 39-15567; AD 2008-13-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8220. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Lindstrand Balloons Ltd. Models 42A, 56A, 60A, 69A, 77A, 90A, 105A, 120A, 150A, 180A, 210A, 240A, 260A, and 310A Balloons [Docket No. FAA-2008-0446; Directorate Identifier 2008-CE-021-AD; Amendment 39-15568; AD 2008-13-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8221. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; BAE Systems (Operations) Limited (Jetstream) Model 4101 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2008-0275; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-335-AD; Amendment 39-15565; AD 2008-13-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8222. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747-400, 747-400D, and 747-400F Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2008-0273; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-369-AD; Amendment 39-15566; AD 2008-13-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8223. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Model Falcon 7X Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2008-0641; Directorate Identifier 2008-NM-105-AD; Amendment 39-15573; AD 2008-13-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8224. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting

the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney Canada Corp. (P&WC) Models PW305A and PW305B Turbofan Engines [Docket No. FAA-2008-0664; Directorate Identifier 2008-NE-04-AD; Amendment 39-15579; AD 2008-13-16] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8225. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB-135ER, -135KE, -135KL, and -135LR Airplanes, and Model EMB-145, -145ER, -145MR, -145LR, -145XR, -145MP, and -145EP Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2008-0182; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-262-AD; Amendment 39-15577; AD 2008-13-14] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8226. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB-135BJ Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2008-0194; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-263-AD; Amendment 39-15578; AD 2008-13-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8227. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model DHC-8-400 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2008-0360; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-368-AD; Amendment 39-15570; AD 2008-13-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8228. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Hawker Beechcraft Corporation (Type Certificates No. 3A15, No. 3A16, No. A23CE, and No. A30CE previously held by Raytheon Aircraft Company) F33 Series and Models G33, V35B, A36, A36TC, B36TC, 95-B55, D55, E55, A56TC, 58, 58P, 58TC, G58, and 77 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2007-28434; Directorate Identifier 2007-CE-053-AD; Amendment 39-15580; AD 2008-13-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8229. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dornier Model 328-100 Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2008-0297; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-330-AD; Amendment 39-15586; AD 2008-13-23] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8230. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model DHC-8-400 Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2008-0178; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-366-AD; Amendment 39-15571; AD 2008-13-08] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8231. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 767-200, -300, and -400ER Series Airplanes [Docket No. FAA-2008-0012; Directorate Identifier 2007-NM-204-AD; Amendment 39-15584; AD 2008-13-21] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8232. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; Bollotta & Associates USS Midway Fireworks Display; San Diego Harbor, San Diego, California [Docket No. USCG-2008-0720] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8233. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30615; Amdt. No. 475] received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8234. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30616; Amdt. No. 3276] received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8235. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Low Altitude Area Navigation Route (T-Route); Southwest Oregon [Docket No. FAA-2008-0038; Airspace Docket No. 07-ANM-16] received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8236. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Lewisburg, PA [Docket No. FAA-2007-0276; Airspace Docket No. 07-AEA-16] received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8237. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Lady Lake, FL [Docket No. FAA-2008-0072; Airspace Docket No. 08-ASO-03] received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8238. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Cranberry Township, PA. [Docket No. FAA-2007-0278; Airspace Docket No. 07-AEA-18] received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8239. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Modification of Class D Airspace; Brunswick, ME [Docket No. FAA-2008-0203; Airspace Docket No. 08-ANE-99] received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8240. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Marienville, PA. [Docket No. FAA-2007-0162; Airspace Docket No. 07-AEA-13] received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8241. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Sunbury, PA [Docket No. FAA-2008-0162; Airspace Docket No. 08-AEA-15] received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8242. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment

of Class E Airspace; Susquehanna, PA [Docket No. FAA-2008-0161; Airspace Docket No. 08-AEA-14] received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8243. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Danville, KY [Docket No. FAA-2007-0246; Airspace Docket No. 07-ASO-26] received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8244. A letter from the Attorney Advisor Regulations and Administrative Law United States Coast Guard, DHS, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone; 70th Anniversary Celebration for the Thousand Island International Bridge, St. Lawrence River, Alexandria Bay, NY. [Docket No. USCG-2008-0742] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received August 29, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8245. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30582; Amdt. No. 471] received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8246. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30618; Amdt. No. 3278] received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8247. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30614; Amdt. No. 3275] received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8248. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30592; Amdt. No. 3255] received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8249. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30581; Amdt. No. 3246] received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8250. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30584; Amdt. No. 3248] received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8251. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Damage Tolerance Data for Repairs and Alterations [Docket No. FAA-2005-21693; Amendment Nos. 26-1, 121-337, 129-44] (RIN: 2120-AI32) received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8252. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting

the Department's final rule — Change in Extinguishing Agent Container Requirements [Docket No.: FAA-2007-26969; Amendment Nos. 121-331 and 135-109] (RIN: 2120-AI99) received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8253. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30617; Amdt. No. 3277] received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8254. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30613; Amdt. No. 3274] received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8255. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Hinton, OK [Docket No. FAA-2008-0328; Airspace Docket No. 08-ASW-4] received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

8256. A letter from the Program Analyst, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30619; Amdt. No. 3279] received August 19, 2008, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself and Mr. RAMSTAD):

H.R. 6854. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow the Secretary of the Treasury to establish the standard mileage rate for use of a passenger automobile for purposes of the charitable contributions deduction and to exclude charitable mileage reimbursements from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. COBLE):

H.R. 6855. A bill to extend the authority for the United States Supreme Court Police to protect court officials off the Supreme Court grounds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YARMUTH (for himself and Mr. LAHOOD):

H.R. 6856. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and the Workforce Investment Act of 1998 to award grants to prepare individuals for the 21st century workplace and to increase America's global competitiveness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.R. 6857. A bill to amend section 203(a) of the Clean Air Act to permit the conversion of a motor vehicle for the use of natural gas fuel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CANNON (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ of California):

H.R. 6858. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to make amendments to certain provisions of title 5, United States Code, enacted by the Congressional Review Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (for himself, Mr. WESTMORELAND, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BROUN of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LINDER, Mr. BARROW, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, and Mr. KINGSTON):

H.R. 6859. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 1501 South Slappey Boulevard in Albany, Georgia, as the "Dr. Walter Carl Gordon, Jr. Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mrs. BLACKBURN:

H.R. 6860. A bill to exempt exploration, development, and production of oil and natural gas under leases on Federal lands from State environmental and pollution control laws, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRALEY of Iowa:

H.R. 6861. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the penalty for certain child labor violations; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROWN of South Carolina:

H.R. 6862. A bill to reauthorize the Marine Turtle Conservation Act of 2004; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. HENSARLING:

H.R. 6863. A bill to prevent Government shutdowns; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KING of Iowa (for himself, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. AKIN, Ms. FOX, Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey, and Mr. BACHUS):

H.R. 6864. A bill to prohibit golden parachute payments for former executives and directors of Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KIRK:

H.R. 6865. A bill to award a congressional gold medal to Joseph Barnett Kirsner, M.D., Ph.D., in recognition of his many outstanding contributions to the Nation; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KUHL of New York:

H.R. 6866. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to evaluate the significance of the Newtown Battlefield located in Chemung County, New York, and the suitability and feasibility of its inclusion in the National Parks System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. MCDERMOTT (for himself and Mr. RANGEL):

H.R. 6867. A bill to provide for additional emergency unemployment compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROSKAM:

H.R. 6868. A bill to provide for the development of advanced and alternative energy and increased domestic energy production to achieve American energy independence in 15 years; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Science and Technology, Natural Resources, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in

each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida (for herself and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania):

H. Res. 1423. A resolution congratulating Master Wan Ko Yee, a permanent resident of the United States, on the publication of his teachings and accomplishments in the book titled, "H.H. Dorje Chang Buddha III: A Treasury of True Buddha-Dharma"; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas):

H. Res. 1424. A resolution supporting humanitarian assistance, the protection of civilians, and accountability for abuses in Somalia, and urging concrete progress in line with the Transitional Federal Charter of Somalia toward the establishment of a viable government of national unity; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

366. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the 29th Legislature of Guam, relative to support for Resolution 172 I Mina'Bente Nuebi Na Liheslaturan Guahan for the Agent Orange Equity Act; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 82: Mrs. BACHMANN.  
H.R. 211: Mr. BILBRAY.  
H.R. 219: Mr. ROSKAM and Mr. TERRY.  
H.R. 471: Mr. SCALISE.  
H.R. 503: Mr. DENT.  
H.R. 697: Mr. MARCHANT.  
H.R. 715: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. FARR, and Mr. MICHAUD.  
H.R. 946: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. HARE.  
H.R. 992: Mr. MCGOVERN.  
H.R. 1014: Mr. UPTON.  
H.R. 1524: Mr. CHILDERS.  
H.R. 1576: Mr. ROTHMAN.  
H.R. 1621: Mr. KIND.  
H.R. 1820: Mr. NADLER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.  
H.R. 1843: Mr. SAXTON.  
H.R. 2015: Ms. SPEIER.  
H.R. 2020: Mr. FEENEY, Mr. DENT, and Mr. ALTMIRE.  
H.R. 2032: Mr. ALTMIRE.  
H.R. 2066: Ms. DELAURO.  
H.R. 2116: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.  
H.R. 2232: Mr. INSLEE.  
H.R. 2266: Mr. WALZ of Minnesota.  
H.R. 2279: Mr. HOEKSTRA and Mr. GOODE.  
H.R. 2668: Mr. MCINTYRE.  
H.R. 2842: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.  
H.R. 2864: Mr. SHAYS.  
H.R. 2993: Ms. KAPTUR.  
H.R. 3041: Mr. MOORE of Kansas.  
H.R. 3232: Mr. LAMBORN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. LAMPSON, Ms. HERSETH SANDLIN, and Ms. ESHOO.  
H.R. 3257: Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
H.R. 3319: Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.  
H.R. 3326: Ms. DELAURO, Ms. CASTOR, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, and Mr. DEFAZIO.  
H.R. 3334: Mr. TIM MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. MCINTYRE.  
H.R. 3544: Mrs. EMERSON.  
H.R. 3622: Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina.

H.R. 3689: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. ALTMIRE, and Ms. SHEA-POR-TER.

H.R. 3737: Mr. REYES.  
H.R. 3749: Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
H.R. 3820: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.  
H.R. 3865: Ms. DELAURO.  
H.R. 3929: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. HOLT, Mrs. BIGGETT, and Mr. PLATTS.  
H.R. 4052: Mr. MCINTYRE.  
H.R. 4102: Ms. LEE.  
H.R. 4105: Mr. CHILDERS and Mr. RUSH.  
H.R. 4107: Mr. SHAYS.  
H.R. 4296: Mr. MILLER of North Carolina.  
H.R. 4464: Mr. GARY G. MILLER of California.

H.R. 4544: Ms. WATSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. HIGGINS, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CARSON, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. LINDA T. SANCHEZ of California, Mr. STARK, Mr. KELLER, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. SIREs, Mr. OLVER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BRALEY of Iowa, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. HODES, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Ms. HOOLEY, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. MEEK of Florida, Mr. SALAZAR, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. WAMP, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. PATRICK MURPHY of Pennsylvania, Ms. TSONGAS, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. HELLER, and Mr. NUNES.

H.R. 5180: Mr. GRAVES.  
H.R. 5268: Ms. HARMAN.  
H.R. 5626: Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
H.R. 5673: Mr. ALEXANDER.  
H.R. 5686: Mr. HARE.  
H.R. 5714: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BARRETT of South Carolina, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. MAHONEY of Florida, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. WU, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.  
H.R. 5793: Mr. MACK, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. BOUSTANY, and Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.

H.R. 5854: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KLEIN of Florida, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. FILNER.  
H.R. 5905: Mr. CULBERSON.  
H.R. 5950: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.  
H.R. 5951: Mr. LIPINSKI.  
H.R. 6020: Mr. BACA.  
H.R. 6029: Ms. LEE.  
H.R. 6045: Ms. HIRONO and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H.R. 6066: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. GRIJALVA.  
H.R. 6072: Mr. LANGEVIN.  
H.R. 6126: Mr. BERMAN and Mr. STARK.  
H.R. 6139: Mr. HELLER.  
H.R. 6151: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 6172: Mr. BERRY and Mr. DEFAZIO.  
H.R. 6259: Mr. NADLER.  
H.R. 6287: Mr. MAHONEY of Florida.  
H.R. 6288: Mr. FEENEY.  
H.R. 6368: Mr. FEENEY.  
H.R. 6373: Mr. LATTI.  
H.R. 6375: Ms. WOOLSEY.  
H.R. 6379: Mr. ROHRBACHER.  
H.R. 6407: Ms. WOOLSEY.  
H.R. 6444: Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota.  
H.R. 6453: Mrs. CUBIN.  
H.R. 6462: Mr. POE.  
H.R. 6491: Mr. KLINE of Minnesota.  
H.R. 6520: Ms. BORDALLO and Mr. ISRAEL.  
H.R. 6559: Mr. LIPINSKI.  
H.R. 6562: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. ORTIZ, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.

H.R. 6566: Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida and Mr. LEWIS of California.  
H.R. 6567: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.  
H.R. 6568: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.  
H.R. 6577: Mr. TIBERI.

H.R. 6581: Mr. ROSS and Ms. CORRINE BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 6591: Mr. SALAZAR, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. TANCREDO, and Mr. LAMBORN.

H.R. 6598: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. ISRAEL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. WU, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MOORE of Kansas, Mr. GERLACH, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Ms. HIRONO, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 6611: Mr. MAHONEY of Florida.

H.R. 6613: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 6617: Mr. Fortuño, Mr. SIREs, Ms. LEE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. BACA.

H.R. 6625: Ms. SOLIS, Mr. LEVIN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. BEAN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 6636: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 6662: Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 6680: Mr. RANGEL and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 6686: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 6691: Mr. PUTNAM, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. PLATTS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. BOOZMAN, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. FOXF, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mr. FEENEY.

H.R. 6696: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. GOODE, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. PENCE, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. WALBERG, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. BONNER, Mr. PRICE of Georgia, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. MCHENRY, Mrs. BACHMANN, and Mr. SCALISE.

H.R. 6709: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. PETRI, Mr. HARE, and Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 6747: Mr. POE.

H.R. 6783: Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 6788: Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia and Mr. BROWN of South Carolina.

H.R. 6798: Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 6817: Mr. KAGEN and Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas.

H.R. 6846: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.J. Res. 12: Mr. KUHL of New York.

H.J. Res. 36: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. CLEAVER.

H. Con. Res. 22: Mr. KUCINICH.

H. Con. Res. 40: Mr. BARLETT of Maryland and Mr. TERRY.

H. Con. Res. 81: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mrs. EMERSON.

H. Con. Res. 341: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. COURTNEY.

H. Con. Res. 378: Mrs. DRAKE, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. WHITFIELD of Kentucky, Mrs. CAPPs, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. ISSA, Ms. FALLIN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mrs. SCHMIDT, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. CANTOR, Mr. PENCE, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mrs. MUSGRAVE, Mr. SULLIVAN, Mr. GOODE, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. BONNER, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mrs. BACHMANN, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. RADANOVICH, and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.

H. Con. Res. 405: Mrs. EMERSON and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H. Con. Res. 409: Mr. MCCOTTER.

H. Res. 598: Mr. MCINTYRE.

H. Res. 757: Mr. HOLT.  
 H. Res. 1064: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. CARSON, Mr. DENT, and Mr. GERLACH.  
 H. Res. 1200: Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. BISHOP of New York, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. BERRY, and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida.  
 H. Res. 1217: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. McDERMOTT.  
 H. Res. 1232: Mr. MCHUGH.  
 H. Res. 1272: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mrs. CUBIN, Ms. BORDALLO, and Ms. KAPTUR.  
 H. Res. 1303: Mrs. MUSGRAVE.  
 H. Res. 1310: Mr. TOWNS.  
 H. Res. 1333: Ms. CLARKE, Mr. CARNAHAN, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. SHULER, Mr. TANNER, Mr. BOYD of Florida, Mr. WALZ of Minnesota, Ms. SCHWARTZ, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MICHAUD, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. CHILDERS, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BARROW, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. EMANUEL, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. WEXLER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. FILNER, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. BERMAN, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H. Res. 1364: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. TURNER, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. COOPER, Mr. GINGREY, Mr. KLINE of Minnesota, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. SAXTON, and Mr. LATHAM.  
 H. Res. 1377: Mr. HONDA and Mr. GILCHREST.  
 H. Res. 1397: Mr. MICHAUD and Mr. HOLDEN.  
 H. Res. 1401: Mr. SIRES.  
 H. Res. 1414: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.  
 H. Res. 1416: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. BROWN of South Carolina, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. ALEXANDER.

---

#### CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks,

limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

The amendment to be offered by Representative JEFF FLAKE or a designee to H.R. 3667 the Missisquoi and Trout Rivers Wild and Scenic River Study Act of 2008, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(d), 9(e), or 9(f) of rule XXI.

---

#### DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 5977: Mr. HUNTER.